


EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY

Oxford

HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY





Wicks & P. B. C.

The Large Study at Christ Church.

Wicks & P. B. C.

283.092
P979l

v.3

Life of
Edward Bouverie Pusey

DOCTOR OF DIVINITY
CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH; REGIUS PROFESSOR OF
HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

BY

HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D.

D.C.L.; LL.D.; LATE CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF ST. PAUL'S

EDITED AND PREPARED FOR PUBLICATION BY THE

REV. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A.

PRINCIPAL OF THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE
AND VICAR OF CUDDESDON, OXFORD

REV. ROBERT J. WILSON, D.D.

LATE WARDEN OF KEEBLE COLLEGE

IN FOUR VOLUMES: VOL. III

With Portraits and Illustrations

93926

Fourth Edition

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1898

All rights reserved

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE



PREFACE TO VOL. III

THE present volume continues Dr. Liddon's biography of Dr. Pusey, roughly speaking from 1845 to 1858, over a period which, in its relation to the English Church, must be considered the most important portion of his life. Dr. Liddon himself in a general division of his work used to describe this period as 'the Struggle.' Dean Church, in the concluding passage of his account of the Oxford Movement, speaks of the record of this time as 'almost more important than the history of the Movement' itself.

Many incidental matters of wide and deep interest were exercising Pusey's mind, and were being urged forward by him during these years. He was advancing Hebrew studies in the University by the conscientious discharge of his professorial duties. He was promoting plans for the extension of University education. He was endeavouring to protect what he felt were the deeper interests of education amidst the reforms of a University Commission. He was restoring 'the religious life' in the Church of England by the organization of Sisterhoods.

But the real importance of his work at this period was of a different character. It lay in his slowly converting the authorities of the Church and the country at large to the belief that the ground on which the Tractarians stood was solid. In 1845 the mass of English people were inclined to believe that Tractarian principles had no rightful home in the Church of England, and that those who held them must eventually accept the whole Papal system. Pusey was striving through all these years to shew that the contrary was the case, that, when freed from Puritan gloss and Protestant tradition, the Anglican Formularies legitimately covered all that Tractarians had advanced. By re-iterated assertion and convincing argument, as well as by persistent refusal to retreat or to move Romewards, he brought men first to consider and then to acquiesce in his own view of Anglicanism. It was thus that he vindicated the Anglican claim to the doctrine of Regeneration, of Absolution, of the Real Presence, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and other important truths.

His position was naturally regarded at first with the gravest suspicion. It involved a view of Anglicanism long lost sight of in the Evangelical and Latitudinarian teaching that was current; it was popularly confused with Romanism; many who had held it had joined the Roman Communion: yet Pusey, while maintaining it, refused to identify himself with any declaration against Rome. The present volume helps to explain on what grounds

he adopted such a position. No one was more anxious than he to prevent secessions to Rome : not only was he conscious of the grave defects of the Papal system, but he was also in dread of weakening the National Church, which he felt must necessarily be the great stronghold of national religion. Still he was convinced that nothing would cause more numerous secessions than any action curtailing that Catholic tradition of primitive doctrine and practice which had been Providentially retained at the Reformation and to which the Caroline divines had constantly appealed. The Church of England, as we know it at present, shews how far he achieved his purpose, and how far his convictions were well-grounded.

But throughout all this long warfare it must be noticed that Pusey never liked controversy for controversy's sake, nor indeed was it as a mere theory that he was anxious to defend the Sacramental system. If he loved and defended it, it was because he believed that it was the appointed way for restoring men to their true relation to God, and for enabling them with Divine aid to develop the fullness of the Christian character. It was the desire, in one word, 'to save souls,' that actuated him in incurring so much obloquy and in enduring this long struggle.

By the date at which this volume closes, the work of vindicating the Catholic side of Anglicanism was far from being completed. But the principle on which that vindication rests was beginning to be

acknowledged, and was recommended by the pertinacious loyalty and self-sacrificing work of the Catholic party. It was already recognized by some of the rulers of the Church who had originally been suspicious, and also by the common sense of the nation which was watching the course of events.

Meanwhile Pusey's influence was steadily spreading throughout the English Communion. It was felt, that amidst the ecclesiastical troubles of the day he was in reality the one great leader, in spite of his own reluctance to acknowledge it. It was beginning to be seen that not only was there more to be said for 'Puseyism' than had been thought to be the case, but that its existence was fundamentally strengthening the Church of England. In view of the new forces that were gathering both against the Church and religion, many were thankful that it was so.

We are bound again to record the sense of grateful obligation felt by Dr. Liddon to all those who have so generously lent correspondence for the purpose of this biography. We must ourselves specially thank Sir Henry Longley, K.C.B., and others in this regard: we have also to thank Mr. Ryman Hall of Oxford, for the use of Mr. Keble's portrait; and Miss Marriott of Eastleigh, Hampshire, for permission to insert the portrait of the Rev. Charles Marriott.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

THE editors are glad to take this opportunity of expressing their great regret that certain letters from Bishop Wilberforce were published in the first two editions of this volume without the permission of his representatives. The letters were found incorporated in Dr. Liddon's manuscript, and there was reason to suppose that permission had been obtained in this as in the other cases. This, however, seems to have been a mistake. The editors therefore tender their apologies to Mr. R. G. Wilberforce for thus infringing his rights. They also regret that by inadvertence in one or two instances, and in another by a printer's error, the references were not given to extracts from the Life of Bishop Wilberforce. These omissions have now been supplied as far as possible.

The editors wish to express their thanks to Mr. R. G. Wilberforce for the permission to use his father's letters, which he has now granted.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III



CHAPTER I. 1845.

	PAGE
EARLY DAYS OF ANGLICAN SISTERHOODS	I

CHAPTER II. 1845—1846.

RELATIONS WITH BISHOP WILBERFORCE—FIRST UNIVERSITY SERMON AFTER SUSPENSION	33
--	----

CHAPTER III. 1846.

THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC—BISHOP GOBAT'S APPOINTMENT—SCHEMES FOR EXTENSION OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION—ILLNESS AT TENBY	70
---	----

CHAPTER IV. 1846.

PENITENCE AND CONFESSION	94
------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER V. 1847.

ST. SAVIOUR'S, LEEDS—THE FIRST HARVEST OF DISAPPOINTMENT	112
--	-----

CHAPTER VI. 1847—1848.

PUSEY'S ISOLATION—HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ROME MISUNDERSTOOD—LETTERS TO MR. GLADSTONE—PROJECT OF A COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE—LAST PHASE OF THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY .	137
--	-----

CHAPTER VII. 1845—1849.

	PAGE
CARE OF THE POOR—IRISH FAMINE—FREE TRADE— GLADSTONE'S ELECTION FOR OXFORD UNIVERSITY— ADMISSION OF JEWS TO PARLIAMENT—DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL—APPENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE	167

CHAPTER VIII. 1847—1849.

HAYLING ISLAND—VOCATIONS TO A SINGLE LIFE—PARK VILLAGE—MISS SELLOON—FOUNDATION OF THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY—THE BISHOP OF EXETER'S INQUIRY—THE CHOLERA AT DEVONPORT	186
--	-----

CHAPTER IX. 1847—1850.

THE GORHAM CASE—THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY— APPENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE	201
--	-----

CHAPTER X. 1850.

RESULTS OF THE GORHAM CONTROVERSY—PROCEEDINGS IN LONDON CHURCH UNION—WORK ON THE ROYAL SUPREMACY—CONTROVERSIES WITH MASKELL, ALLIES, AND DODSWORTH—LETTER TO REV. W. U. RICHARDS	238
---	-----

CHAPTER XI. 1850.

PROTEST ON THE ROYAL SUPREMACY—PROPOSED ANTI- ROMAN DECLARATION—DECLARATION OF LOYALTY TO THE ENGLISH CHURCH BY PUSEY AND KEBLE— SECESSIONS OF ARCHDEACONS MANNING AND R. I. WILBERFORCE	271
--	-----

CHAPTER XII. 1850—1852.

PAPAL AGGRESSION—BISHOP BLOMFIELD'S CHARGE— LETTER TO BISHOP OF LONDON—BISHOP WILBER- FORCE'S INHIBITION—INHIBITION WITHDRAWN—AP- PENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE	291
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII. 1852.

THE EXETER SYNOD—PLACE OF LAITY IN SYNODS—RE- VIVAL OF CONVOCATION—BOOK ON THE 'COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH'	341
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV. 1850—1852.

	PAGE
ST. SAVIOUR'S, LEEDS—THE SECOND HARVEST OF DIS- APPOINTMENT—CORRESPONDENCE: BEGINNINGS OF RITUALISM—PENITENTIARIES—IRVINGISM—PURGA- TORY	355

CHAPTER XV. 1854.

THE UNIVERSITY REFORM ACT OF 1854.	379
--	-----

CHAPTER XVI. 1853—1858.

COMMEMORATION, 1853—FIRST ELECTION TO HEBDOMADAL COUNCIL—UNIVERSITY BUSINESS—DEATHS OF LADY EMILY PUSEY, PHILIP PUSEY, LADY LUCY PUSEY, DEAN GAISFORD, DR. MILL, CHARLES MARRIOTT	403
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII. 1853—1860.

SECOND PERIOD OF EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY—SERMON ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST—CASE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON—CHARGE OF THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN— APPENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE	422
---	-----

APPENDIX.

LIST OF TRACTS FOR THE TIMES	473
INDEX	481

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE LARGE STUDY AT CHRIST CHURCH.	<i>Frontispiece</i>
PORTRAIT OF JOHN KEBLE	<i>to face page</i> 96
FACSIMILE OF ONE OF DR. PUSEY'S LETTERS.	" " 257
DR. PUSEY'S LODGINGS IN CHRIST CHURCH (DRAWING- ROOM SIDE)	<i>p.</i> 403
PORTRAIT OF CHARLES MARRIOTT.	<i>to face page</i> 420

THE LIFE

OF

EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY

CHAPTER I.

EARLY DAYS OF ANGLICAN SISTERHOODS.

1845.

‘Be it mine

One law to cherish, and to track one line,
Straight on towards heaven to press with single bent,
To know and love my God, and then to die content.’

NEWMAN’S *Occasional Verses*, cix.

A SLIGHT anticipation of the chronological order of events was for obvious reasons necessary in the concluding pages of the last volume. But as a matter of fact the building of St. Saviour’s, Leeds, was far from being the only great practical scheme which occupied Pusey’s thoughts in the dark days of 1845. Simultaneously with this, his thoughtful interest was enlisted in another kind of work, which, although it did not at the moment attract so much attention, was yet destined to have very wide and deep results on the life of the English Church. On March 26, 1845, at Park Village West, Regent’s Park, under Pusey’s guidance, there was inaugurated the first attempt to revive the Sisterhood life in the English Church.

Several influences would appear to have combined to guide Pusey’s mind in this direction. The first call for such institutions was found in the condition of the

great cities, and especially of the East End of London, which for many years had occupied so large a place in Pusey's thoughts and charities. He was satisfied that unless the hands of the clergy were strengthened by the disciplined love of Christians, not of necessity in holy orders, but led by Divine grace to give themselves up to a life of sacrifice, little could be done to recover masses of population which had outgrown all the existing machinery of the Church. Influencing him also in the same direction were the considerations suggested by conversations which he had often heard in his early years, in which the difficulty of finding suitable employment for many unmarried women had been much insisted on. Indeed, this had been a traditional source of uneasiness among the gentry and middle classes in England ever since the Reformation¹. Such ideas were, so to speak, in the air. An able writer, with even violent prejudices against the Church of Rome, regrets that 'in the wholesale extirpation of monastic institutions the nunneries were swept away. The good which would have resulted from converting them into Protestant establishments is so obvious, that few persons can have regarded the present state of society in these kingdoms, as it affects women, without regretting that an opportunity for alleviating so much evil should have been neglected².'

Another consideration was suggested to Pusey by his studies. It was impossible to read the Catholic Fathers, especially St. Augustine and St. Jerome—writers who, for different reasons, profoundly influenced him—without observing the stress which they laid on the single life, whether of men or women, when consecrated to the service of God. This side of their teaching had been lost sight of by that section of Anglican divines which regarded antiquity not as a guide in faith or morals, but merely as a storehouse of polemical weapons against the Church of Rome. But the nobler minds in the English Church had never altogether forgotten this element of early Christian belief and feeling. Hooker, though a married man, yet held that a single life

¹ 'The Protestant Monastery, or Christian Economics,' by the Rev. Sir George Wheler. 12mo, 1698.

² *Quarterly Review*, xxii. 90, July, 1819, art. 'British Monachism.'

is a thing 'more angelical and divine'.¹ Bishop Andrewes, in his well-known 'Devotions,' gives thanks for 'the Virgins, flowers of purity, celestial gems, brides of the Immaculate Lamb'²; and it is recorded of him on his tomb in St. Saviour's, Southwark, that 'coelebs migravit ad aureolam coelestem'.³ Bishop Montague insisted on the distinction between precepts of morality and counsels of Christian perfection⁴; Laud declared that, in disposing of ecclesiastical promotions, he should prefer the single man before the married⁵; Jeremy Taylor says that 'Virginity' of the 'chosen and voluntary' kind is 'a life of angels, the enamel of the soul, the huge advantage of religion, the great opportunity for the retirements of devotion'.⁶ Thorn-dike maintains that 'in the profession of monastic life there is ground for presuming that those who live in it come nearer what our baptism professeth, by the means thereof, than others can do'.⁷ It was this conviction which had led to the memorable effort of Nicholas Ferrar to establish a religious community at Little Gidding in the time of Charles I.; and, in the next century, the deepest motive for such institutions is stated in a noble passage of Law's 'Serious Call':—

'If the religion of Christians is founded upon the infinite humiliations, the cruel mockings and scourgings, the prodigious sufferings, the poor persecuted life and painful death of a crucified Son of God; what wonder is it if many humble adorers of this profound mystery—many affectionate lovers of a crucified Lord—should renounce their share of worldly pleasures and give themselves up to a continual course of mortification and self-denial; that thus suffering with Christ here, they may reign with Him hereafter?

'If truth itself hath assured us that *there is but one thing needful*, what wonder is it, that there should be some amongst Christians so full of faith as to believe this in the highest sense of the words, and to desire such a separation from the world, that their care and attention

¹ Eccl. Pol. v. 73. 1.

² 'Devotions.' Oxford, Parker, 1846, Pt. ii. p. 53.

³ 'Life,' by Isaacson, p. xxxiii. Oxford, Parker, 1854.

⁴ 'Appeal,' p. 215. 1 Cor. vii. 25; St. Matthew xix. 12.

⁵ Heylin's 'Life,' p. 224.

⁶ 'Holy Living,' c. ii. § 3. Works, vol. iii. p. 56. Ed. Eden.

⁷ 'Epilogue III.' Works, iv. p. 818. Cf. 'Reformation of Church of Engl.' Sect. xxxvii; Works, v. 571. 'It is certainly a blot in the reformation which we possess that we are without it' [the monastical life].

to the one thing needful may not be interrupted? If our Blessed Lord hath said, *If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow Me*;—what wonder is it that there should be some such zealous followers of Christ, so intent upon heavenly treasure, so desirous of perfection, that they should renounce the enjoyment of their estates, choose a voluntary poverty, and relieve all the poor they are able? If the great Apostle, St. Paul, hath said, “*He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord*,” and that “*there is this difference also between a wife and a virgin;—the unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit*,”—what wonder is it, if the purity and perfection of the virgin state hath been the praise and the glory of the Church in its first and purest ages¹?

But the Puritan feeling of the seventeenth century had set strongly in an opposite direction to that of Christian antiquity and the best English divines. The average Puritan divine regarded the married state as a kind of certificate of Protestant orthodoxy. The ‘Evangelical Revival’ which had honourably distinguished itself by insisting on a Christian’s renunciation of the worldly life, could not, in this particular, disentangle itself from the fetters of the Puritan tradition; and thus, in the early years of this century, Puritan zeal combined with worldly indifference to depreciate the single life consecrated to the service of God; and the language of the Fathers, which seemed so much a matter of course to the early and undivided Church, had almost the character of a new revelation² to the student-minds of the Oxford Movement.

This consideration weighed with Pusey all the more from causes nearer home. The disposition and intentions of his daughter Lucy seemed to him to have about them a Providential character. As a very young child she appears to have expressed her desire to lead a single life, devoted to God’s service: and her father, it need not be said, was not likely to check this. Such a desire specially recommended itself to his sympathy, because after his great sorrow

¹ Law’s ‘*Serious Call*,’ chap. ix. [vide *Christian Remembrancer*, vii. p. 257.]

² The publication by Mr. A. J.

Christie of a translation of St. Ambrose’s treatise on Virginity caused quite a sensation.

in May, 1839, Pusey considered that henceforth a single life had been ordered for himself by Divine Providence: and sorrow made entire self-consecration to God easy, and, if the expression might be used, natural. Then, too, he saw around him religious zeal which threatened to waste itself in irregular efforts. He knew something about hearts, sick of this world, whose very energy threatened to become disease, and to prey upon itself if not guided by some outward rule. Might they not drift into extravagances, or even away from the English Church, if the warmth of their religious feelings was uncontrolled¹? Thus on December 18, 1839, he writes to Keble:—

‘N[ewman] and I have separately come to think it necessary to have some “Sœurs de Charité” in the Anglo-Catholic [Church]. He is going to have an article on it in the *B[ritish] C[ritic]*. If no one else writes it, he will do it himself. I have named it since to very different sorts of persons, and all are taken with it exceedingly, (except B. H[arrison], who (as Archbishop’s Chaplain) is half afraid of it,) and think that there would be numbers of people who are yearning to be employed that way. My notion was that it might begin by regular employment as nurses, in hospitals and lunatic asylums, in which last Christian nursing is so sadly missed. B. H. says that in Guy’s the nurses are called still “Sister Agnes,” “Sister Mary,” &c.’

Another correspondent to whom Pusey applied was the Rev. W. Perceval Ward, Rector of Compton Valence. Mr. Ward had resided much abroad, and had interested himself in the Sisterhood of St. Vincent de Paul, as well as other forms of the community life on the continent. He pressed upon Pusey that unless the English Church could produce something which should emulate the work of those beneficent associations, the population of our large towns would be lost to religion altogether, or would become Roman Catholic.

REV. W. P. WARD TO E. B. P.

Feb. 24, 1840.

Certainly our undisciplined minds, our internal differences, and our external separation, seem to present insurmountable difficulties. But yet I do not see that a doubtful success should deter you from so plain a duty. The simple truth, from which we cannot escape, is that thousands of souls, the care of the Church of England, are, year by

¹ Cf. *Brit. Crit.*, No. 60, Oct. 1841, p. 367.

year, allowed to perish, because we dare not make ventures beyond our old and, for these times, inefficient machinery. Surely at such a time everything but principle is to be risked.

Newman's thoughts on the subject at this moment are given in a letter to his friend Bowden:—

Feb. 21, 1840.

' . . . Pusey is at present very eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy. I feel sure that such institutions are the only means of saving some of our best members from turning Roman Catholics; and yet I despair of such societies being *made* externally. They must be the expression of an inward principle. All one can do is to offer the opportunity. I am sceptical, too, whether they can be set up without a quasi-vow.' . . .¹

Somewhat earlier Pusey had written still more fully to the friend whose great practical ability would have made his opinion and co-operation especially valuable.

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. HOOK.

Christ Church, Dec., 1839.

I want very much to have one or more societies of 'Sœurs de la Charité' formed: I think them desirable (1) in themselves as belonging to and fostering a high tone in the Church, (2) as giving a holy employment to many who yearn for something, (3) as directing zeal, which will otherwise often go off in some irregular way, or go over to Rome. The Romanists are making great use of them to entice over our people; and I fear we may lose those whom one can least spare; but this is secondary. I think the other two primary, and that they are calculated to draw a blessing upon the Church in which they are found, as the Fathers always speak of the virgins. It seemed best that at first they should not be so discursive as those of the Romish Church in Ireland, but be employed in hospitals, lunatic asylums, prisons, among the females. Do you know of any who would engage in it on a small scale, quietly, or one who would be a Mother Superior, i. e. one fitted to guide it? . . .

Ever your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

Hook does not appear to have answered Pusey's earlier letters on the subject: his hands were too full. But in June, 1840, he wrote at some length his hopes of what was possible.

¹ Newman's 'Letters and Correspondence,' ii. 299.

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

Vicarage, Leeds, June 9, 1840.

. . . I perfectly agree with you in thinking it to be most important to have a class of persons acting under us and answering to the Sisters of Charity in some foreign Churches. But there will be great difficulties in the way. Although we shall obtain the co-operation of the really pious of all classes ultimately, there will be much opposition from those 'Evangelical' ladies who at present control the visiting societies, and employ the clergy as their agents: and we all know that the *Record* spirit in such persons will hurry them into all kind of calumnies in which they will be joined by the profane. This in itself ought not to be cared for; but it would be important to avert the storm until we have been able to obtain a fair hearing from those of their followers who are really pious. I am always an advocate for exhibiting works before principles. Let the good be done before we tell people why and how it is done. What I should like to have done is this: for you to train an elderly matron, full of zeal and discretion, and thoroughly imbued with right principles, and for her to come here and take lodgings with two or three other females. Let their object be known to none but myself, and I would speak of them merely as well-disposed persons willing to assist my curates and myself, as other persons do, in visiting the sick. We should attend to their *principles*, but draw up no rules, except such as might be absolutely necessary for the guidance of the household, and there should be no distinction of dress. You should lay down for them some plan for their guidance in visiting the sick: I mean, how far they may read and pray under my sanction as priest of the parish. Let this go on for twelve months at least. We could then have a meeting of our friends prepared to support this establishment, and we could consult with the matron as well as with my curates, and at that time, with experience gained, draw up rules, such as would be adapted to the circumstances of English society, and we could at that time also decide on the dress to be worn—which ought to be just sufficient to distinguish them and yet not sufficient to subject them to remark. . . .

Believe me to be most affectionately yours,

W. F. HOOK.

Hook, who hoped that his own sister would take up this life, characteristically suggested that Pusey should adopt 'Greek terms and forms rather than Latin ones; as less likely to give unnecessary offence.' 'Remember,' he wrote, 'you are in advance of the age: deal tenderly with the babes.'

While Pusey was corresponding with Hook on the subject, he was also communicating with an English physician, Mr. W. Greenhill, who was studying medicine

in Paris. Mr. Greenhill undertook to obtain for him the rules of the Sisters of the Order of St. Augustine, and also those of St. Vincent de Paul. Besides assisting Pusey materially by his inquiries and letters, among other things he proposed to translate a German Protestant pamphlet on the subject. Pusey, after criticizing the pamphlet on other grounds, observed that—

[Sept. 20, 1840.]

It seems to go no further than we have got already, forming voluntary associations among persons in the midst of domestic duties, and with very little notion of discipline, or of their acting under the directions of the spiritual pastor. They are, at most, allies, not troops under his command. It is even curious, how he finds himself in a difficulty, that the plan which he proposes would fail in some respects because the parties had domestic duties, and yet that it does not occur to him that there might be found those who had no constraining domestic duties, and so might give themselves wholly to this work. It is deficient in recommending self-devotion.

It would do us harm, too, that he speaks so strongly against vows, as of something inferior. We, who are admitted to the priesthood, are under vows; we devote ourselves for a whole life: why should not women also for their offices? It seems to me a more religious way of devoting themselves to their office, than if they reserved to themselves the power to draw back. Our very word 'devoting himself' implies a vow. Only, of course, they should have proved themselves, before they venture to make it. We must be very slow about making vows, because in the state of things around us, there are so many temptations to break them; but still I should be sorry for anything to be published against them in the abstract.

There is also a certain indefiniteness in his way of speaking (which Germans are so apt to fall into) about the 'rule of love,' 'of free love'; as though love were less free because under rule. I do not think it would suit us, whose great difficulty it is to be brought under rule. Then, too, there is a vagueness of speech, religiously, which I think would be bad for us. . . .

Meanwhile, the desire to attempt some form of disciplined life devoted to prayer and good works received a reinforcement from an unexpected quarter. The Society of Friends has always been distinguished for its combination of philanthropic effort with attempts to cultivate the Christian life as understood by its founders; and some of its members at this juncture made a proposal to supply the wards of Guy's Hospital with nurses who should pursue their work

in the spirit of Sisters of Charity. This proposal was submitted to Mr. Harrison (the father of the Archbishop's Chaplain), who then controlled the affairs of the hospital; and he drew up a few rules to be adopted by the applicants. These rules included, among other things, attendance at the daily and Sunday services in the Chapel—an obligation which it seems the Quakers were willing to accept, but which, Mr. Harrison thought, would give a Church-like direction to the effort. Mr. B. Harrison reported this to Pusey, and asked whether he knew any ladies who would devote themselves to such an object. Pusey bethought him of Dr. Hook's sister. He sent her the paper which described the Quaker project, observing that it 'contained an opening for something better.' Yet he was bound to say that he could not discover in the plan, as proposed, those moral features which alone command success in such enterprises. It only contemplated so much self-denial as was essential for a nurse's work.

'Its error,' he observed, 'seems to be the prevailing error of the day, that money will produce everything. Persons of Christian temper, self-devotion, self-denial, are to start up at the touch of this golden wand, instead of being raised up as God's blessing and gift to His Church.'

In August, 1840, Hook replied:—

'My sister would do well for one of the Sisters of Charity: but she must devote herself at present to my mother. It is a great thing to find the first movement made by the Quakers. It will smooth the way before us.'

In October, Miss Hook had made up her mind, and her brother was roused.

'I have received a letter,' he wrote to Pusey, 'from my sister, who has determined never to marry and to become a Sister of Charity, if she survives my mother. . . . What I wish you very earnestly to do is to . . . warn her that her very first duty is to devote herself entirely to my mother. To my mother both myself and my sister are indebted for all our early impressions of religion.'

Miss Hook was indeed far from being the only person who was being silently drawn towards a devoted single life. Already rumours were abroad of such an institution having been already set on foot.

REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO MISS GIBERNE.

Nov. 4, 1840.

What you hear about a convent is a mere mistake. I know nothing of it. But I am very glad to hear that such ideas are spreading, and talking is the first step to doing. Several places are in agitation for establishing Sisters of Mercy, whether for hospitals or for parochial visiting; but I expect nothing of them yet. It is a great thing if persons communicate to each other their ideas and wishes. No one can begin solitarily, but the feeling that there are others like-minded gives at once confidence and opportunity. . . . Women (no, nor men still less) would not live together without quarrelling, as things are among us. A very strong religious principle and a tight discipline would be necessary. But it is a very good thing for people to be thinking about. Nothing would need more counting the cost¹.

But there was at least one very decided approach to a dedicated life.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. H. NEWMAN.

Christ Church, Trinity Sunday [June 5], 1841.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

A young lady, who is very grateful for your teaching, is purposing to-day to take a vow of holy celibacy. She has difficulties and anxieties in her position. She has attended St. Mary's since she has been in Oxford, and hopes to receive the Holy Communion there to-day, as also being part of her self-devotion. It was wished that you should know it and remember her. You will know her by her being dressed in white with an ivory cross. . . .

Yours ever gratefully and affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

The lady referred to in this letter was Miss Marian Hughes, who has lived to become the revered Superior of the Convent of the Holy Trinity, Woodstock Road, Oxford. Near her, knelt Lucy Pusey, to receive her first Communion, and to consecrate to God the short life which was to end within three years. Newman celebrated, and Pusey was present among the congregation.

Shortly after her self-dedication Miss Hughes went to Normandy with the Rev. C. and Mrs. Seager, in order to study, so far as might be possible, the 'religious' life among women in France. At Bayeux they made the acquaintance of the Bishop, and of the Abbé Thomine,

¹ Newman's 'Letters,' &c., ii. 315.

Canon of the Cathedral and Archdeacon of Caen. M. Thomine was the director of fifteen convents, and he allowed Miss Hughes to go as a visitor to the Hôtel Dieu in Bayeux, which was served by a community of White Augustines or Ursulines. She was received with great cordiality, and was allowed to ask as many questions as she liked. She found the nuns as fervent and simple-hearted as could be wished; perfect harmony reigned between the different grades of Sisters, and the hospital and schools under their management were admirably conducted. The Rule of this House had not been published; but Miss Hughes was allowed by M. Thomine to learn much of it. She afterwards visited the Convent of the Visitation at Caen, which was, of course, under the published Rule of St. Francis de Sales. Pusey was much interested in these details, and in such information as Mr. Seager could collect about the conditions under which temporary vows were allowed in the French Church. In the regulations of the first English community of Sisters it is not difficult to trace the influence of the information thus conveyed. Indeed the Rule first adopted was largely taken from that of St. Francis de Sales, though it was modified after a few years of practical experience.

It will be remembered that Pusey had intended to visit Ireland in 1840 in order to make inquiries respecting the working of the Roman Catholic Sisterhoods in that country. He carried out this project in 1841, but although he visited some convents, and witnessed the reception of a Sister, there is no evidence of his having gathered from this quarter much experience or information which could be turned to account in his projects for Anglican Sisterhoods.

Naturally the realization of his plans and hopes with regard to the 'religious' life of women in England, as of all great projects of real and permanent value, was attained but slowly. Even before the troubles of 1843 arising out of the sermon on the Eucharist, there was much that was unfavourable to any further prosecution of such plans. But Pusey had already seen in such delay the hand of God's

Providence: time was needed to discipline and ripen characters before anything could be attempted with good hope of success.

E. B. P. TO MISS M. HUGHES.

[Christ Church], Feb. 9, 1843.

. . . A longing for a life more given up to devotion and charity is being put into the minds of persons of both sexes. I have heard of much of this sort since I last saw you. The time is not lost, but rather gained, which passes before any formal institution is made. It is too great a work to be brought about readily and yet solidly. It might easily degenerate. The difficulties which people have to go through before they enter upon it are a means of disciplining them to enter upon it aright; and they, meantime, may be disciplining themselves by learning to give up more readily their own wills, bearing contradiction cheerfully, as well as growing continually in the grace and love and fear of God. The great dangers in beginning any such institution would be, that people would not be sufficiently ready to give up their own ways (each wishing to do good in their own), or not have command of temper, so as to bear the ways of those who might be strangers to them, or excited and wayward; or, again, others with a general notion of wishing to devote themselves to God's service, might still not have a standard sufficiently high. I doubt not, then, that while such institutions are for the time withheld, people are being prepared both to enter them in a deeper spirit, and to welcome them more gratefully. Yet there must be continued prayer for them. . . . God bless you.

Yours very faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.

When, on April 22, 1844, Lucy Pusey died, it might have seemed that her father's hopes of restoring the consecrated single life for women were still very far from realization. But, as Pusey afterwards said, he had charged her, as she lay dying, to pray in the presence of her Redeemer for the 'institutions to which she had hoped to belong¹.' He felt it might have been in answer to her prayers, that on the day of her funeral two letters were written to him which not only told him how many other eminent Churchmen shared his desire for the establishment of Sisterhoods, but also gave him great hopes that their foundation was much nearer than had seemed probable. One of these letters was

¹ See vol. ii. p. 386.

from Mr. (afterwards Sir T. D.) Acland, giving an account of two meetings which had been held in London to consider the subject. At the first meeting a letter was read from Bishop Blomfield. The subject was occupying the Bishop's earnest thoughts. The Bishop had consulted the Primate; and although he could not pledge himself beforehand to accept any particular plan, he was ready to consider any matured suggestions. The second meeting was held on the day of Lucy Pusey's funeral: it was attended by Lord Lyttelton, Lord Clive, Lord Camden, Lord John Manners, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Watts-Russell, Mr. Acland, besides Rev. W. Dodsworth and Dr. Hook. Mr. Gladstone, who was absent, wrote in warm sympathy with the object of the meeting.

The second letter to Pusey on that day was from Lord John Manners (now Duke of Rutland), officially communicating the result of the deliberations of this meeting. Dr. Hook had urged that a Lady Superior must first of all be found, since the initiative scheme and plan of proceeding must come from her who was to work it; and Lord John Manners had been instructed by the meeting to ask Pusey whether he knew of any person who was qualified for such a post. When doing so, he informed him that the meeting

'had resolved to take preliminary steps for the establishment and permanent maintenance of a Sisterhood living under a religious Rule and engaged in some work of mercy such as

- '1. Visiting the poor or the sick in their own homes.
- '2. Visiting hospitals, workhouses, or prisons.
- '3. Feeding, clothing, and instructing destitute children.
- '4. Assisting in burying the dead.'

What a solace these letters were to Pusey can easily be imagined. But for the moment he could make no useful suggestion to the London Committee. Many names suggested themselves, but nobody was exactly ready for a part which implied, besides great gifts of character, much special preparation both of heart and life and experience. As Pusey said, in writing to his brother William at this

time, 'The more anxious I am for these institutions, the more anxious I must be that they should be begun in a holy way.'

Pusey's feeling is further illustrated by his correspondence with the father of a young lady who was anxious to become a Sister. This was the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe, Vicar of Bitton, in Gloucestershire, and afterwards Rector of Clyst St. George, near Topsham; so well known in the later years of his life as a leading authority on the subject of Church Bells. Mr. Ellacombe was a man whose knowledge and sympathy made him acquainted with all kinds of subjects and all kinds of people. He had been educated at Oriel under Provost Eveleigh, who held so high a place in the affectionate respect of Keble. He was an intimate friend too of Newman's.

Mr. Ellacombe wrote to ask Pusey whether he could not find for his daughter some situation as a governess where she would enjoy religious advantages and have full occupation. After regretting that he could at the moment make no practical suggestion, Pusey added:—

E. B. P. TO REV. H. T. ELLACOMBE.

June 9, 1844.

. . . It is perhaps going beyond what your letter would strictly entitle me, but if, as a father, I may write to a father, I would venture to suggest what I would do myself, were she my child. I cannot doubt myself that this drawing of people's minds towards a more devoted life, giving themselves to His service, and the ministering to His poor, is, in the main, of God. It has been growing wonderfully during the last years; the minds in which it has been awakened have been the sort of minds which one should expect God would draw onwards: some of those who have been led that way (whom I myself know) have been brought to it remarkably. There has, too, I know, been for some years prayer that God would give us these institutions. It will still be the question whether any individual mind is prepared for it. . . .

Were I her father, I should certainly not, in any case, abruptly check the feeling which she has so strongly, nor even attempt to divert it, only try its steadfastness. It seems to me to want guidance and discipline, and this she herself wishes for. A time of probation might be imposed, during which she might be living, in your house, and among your poor, something of the sort of life she wishes for

hereafter. But I cannot help the feeling that a mind so energetic, and so strongly penetrated with this longing, might become something which might give you deep pleasure and be a source of blessing to others. I have myself seen something of the life of 'Sisters of Charity' and of themselves: and certainly I cannot but deeply long for something of this kind among ourselves, free from that which pains me in the Roman system. Such an institution is actually contemplated in London (as you have seen probably in the papers) which Lord J. Manners has set on foot: he has the conditional approbation of the Bishop: and some years ago a plan of the same sort was sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury (although not carried out because the individuals did not then come forward). This gives a sort of substance to it. Our authorities permit that the trial should be made. It is nothing Utopian, nor the conception of individuals merely. . . .

The subject has been very near my heart for some years: the daughter whom it pleased God lately to take to Himself, had chosen that life and was preparing for it: and I saw in her the healthful influence of looking forward to it. To our Church I am sure it would be a great blessing. We have deep needs, which Sisters of Charity alone can meet, and which as far as they are met now, being relieved by Roman Catholic institutions, the remedy instead of attaching, is withdrawing our poor from us. To our own educated ranks, I am sure, it would be often an exceeding relief, while to many ardent minds, like your daughter's, it will remove many sore temptations away from our Church, and develop high energies. . . .

Yours very faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.

Mr. Ellacombe naturally wished to know how, if his daughter could not be a governess, she was to spend the time which might elapse before the formation of a Sisterhood.

E. B. P. TO REV. H. T. ELLACOMBE.

Christ Church, June 14, 1844.

. . . What one should next wish for your daughter would be, for her to prepare herself in calmness and self-command for that great employment to which she wishes to give her life. The natural place seems to be your own house and among your own poor, and if you had Daily Services, I think she might be put upon a plan, which would be beneficial and calming for her at present, and prepare her for anything more hereafter, if God gives it. But a good deal would depend on what sort of co-operation she might find at home, whether any of her sisters would like the same sort of domestic life—I mean, a life distributed between devotion, charity, and family recreation. . . .

As the plans of the London Committee slowly took shape, Pusey wrote again to Mr. Ellacombe:—

‘Ilfracombe, Feast of St. James, 1844.

‘I have just heard that it is arranged that a house should be taken for Sisters in London, whenever God should make it clear that any are called to it. But at present there is only one ready, and I think that the intervening time will be really a gain in that the individuals will be preparing themselves and understand better how great a preparation of heart is necessary.’

The difficulty which confronted the earnest minds which were bent on this work of reviving Sisterhoods was to find a Superior. How could a Superior be forthcoming who had not been trained in the life which she was to form in others? Clearly, she must be a person of very exceptional qualifications and graces. There would be no lack of ladies with a vocation to a Sister’s life: but a ready-made Superior was what was wanted. The embarrassment was serious; and it ended in a course which had been considered impossible. The institution at starting had for the moment to dispense with any Superior at all.

A small but fairly suitable house was secured for the purpose of the Sisterhood by the Committee of laymen who had made themselves for the time responsible for the expense of this new venture. To those who are familiar with the spacious buildings and beautiful chapels of some of the Sisterhoods of the present day, it may be not without interest to describe the poorness and cramped surroundings of these first beginnings of revived religious houses in England. The house in which the Sisters were to take up their quarters was a small detached house not many minutes walk from Albany Street, Regent’s Park. It has long since disappeared. It contained on the ground floor a parlour, a recreation room, and a small oratory leading into each other. The upper rooms were partitioned into six cells, and there were four attics. The kitchen served as the refectory. The house was throughout plainly furnished. The oratory had a small altar-table with a black cross and scarlet cover, and a lamp. A picture of Christ crucified, copied from Albert Dürer by Mrs. Dodsworth, and some red baize on the walls and windows, completed the decorations.

‘The *μονή*,’ wrote Pusey to Keble on March 1, 1845, ‘is to

be opened in Easter week with two Sisters. There may be four more before Trinity Sunday.' Accordingly on Wednesday in Easter week, March 26, 1845, two ladies arrived at 17 Park Village West. Their names were Miss Jane Ellacombe, known in the community as Sister Anne, or later as Sister Jane, and Miss Mary Bruce, known as Sister Mary. Neither, unfortunately, was in strong health: the younger, Sister Mary, soon required all the attention that could be given her.

After a few weeks they were joined by Miss Terrot, a daughter of the Bishop of Edinburgh. The father was, as he told Pusey, 'very far from those tendencies which commonly go by the name of Tractarian'; but his daughters had 'a desire for greater usefulness, and for more intimate communion with persons whom they could look to as real followers of Christ' than was afforded by their northern home. So the Bishop, 'despairing of their viewing their present position more favourably,' gave 'not a reluctant consent' to their wish to enter a Sisterhood.

It was not until some few weeks later that the young institution had a Superior. The lady who was chosen to preside over it was Miss Langston. She was ten years older than any of her companions: and seems to have been a person of 'strong understanding, fervent piety, and extreme simplicity of manners.' Pusey certainly was impressed by her fervid desire to engage in a more devoted service of God and in works destined to relieve the poor and afflicted, and still more by the anxious self-distrust which is apparent in her correspondence. She never spared herself: she worked harder than any one else. This is certainly true, though no doubt she may not have possessed the ideal qualities of a Superior, fully able to guide a Sisterhood in those anxious days. In fact, no one in the Church of England, whether directors or Sisters, had at that time any practical experience of the requirements of such a life.

Miss Langston's arrival was speedily followed by that of others: two were introduced by Mr. Dodsworth, of Christ

Church, Albany Street¹, in whose parish the Sisters' house was situated, and two more by Mr. Upton Richards. Pusey was 'regarded as the founder, and his office was that of spiritual superintendent'; and he was assisted in his work by Mr. Dodsworth.

So unobtrusive was the inauguration of it, that amid the graver anxieties which during the spring of 1845 centred in Littlemore and Oxford, Pusey forgot even to inform Keble of the opening of the house in Park Village.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

35 Grosvenor Square, Easter Friday [March 28], 1845.

I am vexed that I forgot that you did not know upon what day the little Sisterhood was to commence. Two Sisters entered their home on Easter Wednesday, one [is] Miss E[llacombe]. They are very promising; a third we expect on Friday week. We, i.e. Dodsworth and myself, had a little Service with them on Wednesday: they were in floods of tears, but of joy, in the prayers for them. On Sunday at a quarter to 8 is to be their first Communion subsequent to their solemn entrance. Will you remember them then?

In 1845 any such enterprise as we are describing would have been impossible, had it not been for the generous support of the body of laymen, whose liberality and activity have been already mentioned. They regarded it however from a point of view very different from Pusey's. To them it was less an effort once more to restore the consecrated single life than an attempt to relieve the misery and ignorance of the great towns, and as a tribute to the wisdom and forethought of Robert Southey. A quotation from his 'Colloquies' was placed at the head of the remarkable Paper which they issued shortly after the first Sisterhood was opened, and which deserves to be preserved in its entirety, as recording the intimate relation of some of the best laymen to the most important practical religious effort of that day.

[*Confidential.*]

SISTERS OF MERCY.

'There is . . . in such associations, nothing but what is righteous and holy: nothing but what properly belongs to that *θρησκεία*, that

¹ Pusey had taken a great interest in the building of this church and contributed £1000 towards it.

religious service which the Apostle James, the brother of our Lord, has told us is pure and undefiled before God and the Father. They who shall see such societies instituted and flourishing here, may have a better hope that it may please the Almighty to continue His manifold mercies to this island, notwithstanding the errors which endanger it, and the offences which cry to Heaven.'—Southey's '*Colloquies*,' vol. ii. p. 330.

It has long been a matter of regret to many, that the Church of England possesses no institution similar to that of the Sisters of Mercy.

For many years the internal condition of our great towns, and the intensity of accumulated misery, side by side with our luxury, or comfort, or wealth, have weighed very heavily upon the minds of those who are in any degree acquainted with the state of our poor. Each fresh disclosure, one rapidly succeeding another, has seemed to convey some glimpse only into a world of wretchedness, appalling to every feeling of humanity, but more frightful yet in a Christian nation, where the poor are more especially committed to our care, as members and representatives of Him, 'Who, being rich, for our sakes became poor.'

Yet the evil manifestly could not be met by any ordinary remedies. Amid such fearful extent of distress any unsystematic efforts would necessarily avail little. The very extremity also of the misery rendered it for the most part inaccessible to the efforts of individual charity.

These convictions have, for some time, impressed upon thoughtful minds the necessity of some more organized system. And foremost of all, the late Mr. Southey, deeply impressed with the value of some of the religious orders whose active charity he had witnessed abroad, advocated, with the wonted energy of his powerful mind, the formation of such among ourselves. 'Thirty years hence,' he said in 1829, 'this other reproach may also be effaced, and England may have its Béguines, and its Sisters of Charity. It is grievously in need of them¹.'

The feeling which, under God's good Providence, this earnest and deservedly popular writer widely communicated, has been strengthened by the increased opportunities of witnessing the tranquil and gentle charities of different religious orders on the continent devoted to works of mercy.

The establishment of Protestant Deaconesses in France and Germany testify the same conviction, and the mode in which it is there thought the necessity may be met.

At the same time a longing to be employed in such offices has in this country been silently growing up in the mind of persons, who under favourable circumstances would be enabled to give themselves to them.

¹ '*Colloquies*,' vol. ii. p. 330.

Certainly, for a length of time, earnest and continual prayer has been made to 'the Giver of all good gifts,' that He would bestow upon us similar societies, adapted to our condition, if He saw it to be good for our Church: whence we may the rather hope that the feeling which has of late so wonderfully increased, has been of His gift, Who alone disposeth the hearts of men.

Yet even thus, there were intervening difficulties to be removed. Especially, women, although trusting that they are called by the leading and grace of God to a life of devotion and charity, and desirous of giving themselves to it, seem to need the outward protection of an institution through which they might enjoy mutual help and comfort, and the sympathy and respect of their fellow Christians.

The removal of such difficulties seemed to fall within the provinces of lay members of the Church. Some of those whose names are subscribed to the annexed engagement have accordingly from time to time consulted together, and agreed 'to take the preliminary steps for facilitating the establishment and permanent maintenance of a Sisterhood living under a religious Rule, and engaged in relieving distress wherever it may be found.

'The works of mercy contemplated are such as—

- '1. Visiting the poor or the sick at their own houses.
- '2. Visiting hospitals, workhouses, or prisons.
- '3. Feeding, clothing, and instructing destitute children.
- '4. Giving shelter to distressed women of good character.
- '5. Assisting in the burial of the dead.'

They did not take any active steps without ascertaining (at least to their own satisfaction) that the general object which they have in view is neither in opposition to the principles of the Church of which they are members, nor to the opinions of its chief rulers. While at the same time they think it right to avow distinctly, that no explicit sanction has been given from persons in authority to a plan which is unavoidably in some sense experimental: but it has been thought right to resort to the advice of private clergymen, who had for some years considered the subject.

The present institution has commenced in the parochial district of Christ Church, St. Pancras, in which is a large population of destitute poor.

The incumbent will undertake the direction of its active duties; which in the first instance will be to visit the poor and sick, to discover uncomplaining misery, and to instruct poor children. These duties may be enlarged hereafter in many ways, as the numbers and resources of the institution increase. It is proposed that six hours in each day shall be given to active works of mercy. The members of the institution will only visit under the direction or sanction of the parochial clergy.

Out of various persons who have expressed a desire to join the institution, three have already entered upon their new mode of life. Two more will join the institution about Whitsuntide.

A detached house has been engaged for three years, and furnished with suitable simplicity.

After careful consideration, it has been estimated that an annual sum of £300 a year (assuming the number of Sisters not greatly to exceed six at first), and a further sum of £200 for furniture will be required.

Two ladies have kindly undertaken to collect the fund for the furniture among their female friends.

The following engagement has been entered into in reference to the annual support of the Sisterhood :—

'We the undersigned, having contributed, or intending to contribute, to the maintenance, for the term of three years, of the House about to be opened in the district of Christ Church, St. Pancras, for the reception of Sisters of Mercy, hereby express our intention of using our best endeavours at the close of that term, if the experience obtained in the interval shall justify the expectation of the permanent continuance of the institution, to place its resources upon the footing which may be requisite for its regular support.'

JOHN MANNERS.	W. E. GLADSTONE.
CLIVE.	R. M. MILNES.
CAMDEN.	F. H. DICKINSON.
LYTTELTON.	J. D. WATTS RUSSELL.
JOHN HANMER.	T. D. ACLAND, JUN.
ADARE.	F. A. M'GEACHY.
W. MONSELL.	A. J. B. HOPE.

Subscriptions in aid of the above-mentioned object are received by Messrs. Drummond, Charing Cross, under the name of 'Fund for Sisters of Mercy.'

Like many great institutions, a Sisterhood 'is not made, it grows.' The simple dedicatory service at Park Village West on Easter Wednesday, 1845, was not the inauguration of the first permanent Sisterhood ; it was the beginning of a series of experiments which resulted in many Sisterhoods. Almost everything characteristic to such institutions had yet to be determined ; and could only be determined finally in the light of experience. There was for some time abundant occupation for unsympathetic or discontented critics of this new venture. Only by degrees could its novel relationships and duties be rightly understood.

The first requisite for a Sisterhood is a Rule of Life. Without a Rule of some kind, religious enthusiasm is of little avail, whether for the sanctification of the soul or for

purposes of philanthropy. Enthusiasm is the raw material of the life of a Sisterhood, but if it is to be a lasting and a fertilizing force, it must be controlled and directed by a Rule.

Three years later, in a letter to Mr. A. J. B. Hope, about the early days of the Park Village community, Pusey wrote :—

‘Quinquagesima, 1848.

‘We naturally went by experience. Lord John Manners procured us the rules of the Sisters of Charity at Birmingham. I had some rules by me, used by different bodies in England and on the continent. We took as our basis St. Augustine’s rule, as extant in an Epistle¹ of his to some “Sanctimoniales,” whom he had brought together; thinking it most in accordance with our Church to take rules from one of the Fathers of the Church. On this we engrafted others; always bearing in mind the character of English churchwomen. When it was done, Dodsworth and myself looked over it, with a view to what the Bishop of London would think; and several little points were altered (language chiefly) on his saying, “The Bishop would not like that.” This was kept to be shown to the Bishop, whenever trial enough had been made of the institution, for him to be ready to take it up. *We could not bring it before him sooner, without asking him to do the very thing* which he naturally did not wish to do yet. For if he saw the rules and sanctioned them, the Sisterhood would have been at once under his sanction. This we wished, but could not ask for. When we had thus reviewed the rules, we showed them to J. Keble.’

Pusey was as far as possible from criticizing Bishop Blomfield on the score of his caution. In dealing with new religious experiments, Church authority has been always, and rightly, cautious. The founders of great orders in the Middle Ages had to wait some time for the approval of the highest authority; and it by no means followed that any form of enthusiasm was at once sanctioned and made useful. Macaulay thinks that the Popes would at once have welcomed Wesley and Joanna Southcote whom the Church of England bishops left out in the cold; but there is every reason from history to think that the Popes would have at least waited to see what these enthusiastic people were likely to be, or to effect, before doing so. As

¹ St. Aug. Ep. 211, Opp. ii. 783 sqq., ed. Ben.

soon as Bishop Blomfield was willing to see the Rules, Pusey was delighted to submit them to him. If they were not shewn to him at first, this was out of consideration for the Bishop's natural unwillingness to be prematurely committed to the details of a plan which had not yet stood the test of experience. Mr. Dodsworth's letters to Pusey bear abundant witness to their mutual desire that the Bishop's wishes should be anticipated as far as might be. While the details of the Rule were under discussion, Mr. Dodsworth writes :—

April 28, 1845.

‘The Bishop seems as favourably disposed as I could have expected. We must try to strike out of the rules what would offend him, so that no essential point is sacrificed.’

The Rule of the Sisterhood consisted, in its complete form, of thirty-three chapters, which are not so much a dry code of directions as a series of spiritual exhortations. The object of the Sisterhood is there stated to be ‘to afford opportunities for persons apart from the world and its distractions to perfect holiness in the fear of God, and to grow in the love of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, especially by cherishing and showing forth love to Him in His poor and afflicted brethren.’ Then the various Christian graces of humility, charity, modesty and purity, voluntary poverty, and obedience are insisted on, and practical directions are given for the cultivation of them. There follow the various elements of the devotional side of the Christian life : attendance at the offices of the Church, Holy Communion, the practice of self-examination, confession, meditation or mental prayer, and mortification or fasting. The daily life of a Sister is next provided for by rules for the intentions or purpose with which she is to perform the successive actions of the day ; for silence at certain hours, as befitting souls which have fixed their gaze on God ; for the management of thoughts during silent employments ; for the avoidance of inquisitiveness or meddlesomeness ; for intercourse with persons outside the Sisterhood ; and for times of recreation. Directions are

also given for admitting new Sisters, for the conduct of the Superior, and for the life of the lay Sisters, thus providing for the religious organization of the society. The rest of the Rule may be described as a series of appendices, concerned with the details of daily life and work. The last portion is devoted to the works of mercy which the Sisterhood was to undertake; visiting the sick, teaching in schools, the admission of distressed women to a temporary home, and the distribution of time among these several occupations.

As this is the first beginning of the revived organization of the Sisterhood life, it may be interesting to describe how the day at Park Village was spent.

5	Rise.
5.20-6.15	Breviary offices of Matins and Lauds.
6.15-6.45	Private devotions.
6.45-7	Make beds and clean up rooms.
7-7.30	Prime.
7.30-8.30	Service in Church.
8.30-8.55	Breakfast.
8.55-9.10	Terce.
9.10-12.30	Visiting the poor.
12.30-1	Repose.
1-1.20	Sext and self-examination.
1.20-3	Dinner and recreation.
3-5	Nones and visiting the poor.
5-6	Service in Church.
6-7	Vespers and devotions on the Holy Communion.
7-8	Supper and recreation.
8-9	Reading religious books.
9-10	Compline, self-examination, and private devo- tions.
10	Retire to rest.

It will be observed that besides the Morning and Evening Service of the Church of England, the Sisters said daily in their private chapel the seven Hours of the Breviary. But it was the Breviary not only translated but altered and adapted with the omission of all legendary matter, invocations of saints, and all other features deemed inconsistent with the doctrine of the English Church. The morning and evening offices of the Church did not take up so much time in

associated devotion as was needed by the members of a Society entirely devoted to the service of God : and the older formularies, from which the Prayer-book itself had been taken, yielded the material which was wanting to supply the deficiency. Pusey explained the principle on which he had arranged these devotions in the following letter :—

E. B. P. TO MR. A. J. B. HOPE.

Quinquagesima, 1848.

We knew of no resource but to go to the same source from which our English Prayer-book is taken, and to give them such devotions *as we felt sure we could ourselves use in the Bishop's presence*. The devotions consist chiefly of the Psalms (which some one calls the Prayer-book of the Church) which are said in the course of each week, and the 119th and some few others every day. But the use of the Psalms alone would hardly keep the attention probably. There are also Hymns, from the same source and of the same character as the Veni Creator, readings from Holy Scripture and from the Fathers in the morning, responses of the same character strictly as those in the English Prayer-book, but not the same, else it would be simple repetition.

I would say further what there is not. *There is, of course, nothing discountenanced or only half-countenanced by the Church of England*. There are not even prayers for the departed, nor any legends, much less any mention of the intercession of the saints, nor the Black-letter days in the calendar : *there is nothing but what is framed on the service of the Church of England : there is no passage read from a Father which I could not myself preach in a sermon before the Bishop, nor any prayer which the Bishop himself might not use*. Nor is there anything to draw people off from the English Prayer-book.

It would, then, not be true to say that it is the Breviary translated which they use. It is in no other sense the Breviary than our English Prayer-book is the Breviary. The compilers of our Prayer-book took as much as they could without making the service too long *for the people*. Some think it too long, as it is. We have only taken more of the same sort, with the addition of passages from the Fathers, *the same Fathers* of whom our Homilies speak so highly, and Hymns.

It is to be noticed that in drawing up these devotions nothing was admitted which the English Church had not sanctioned expressly or in principle. Pusey refrained from acting even on the principle of his editions of Avrillon and other foreign devotional works adapted to the use of the English Church. In these works he had admitted everything

which he believed to be true, and which the English Church had not condemned in terms.

‘I know and have regretted,’ Pusey continues, ‘that the Bishop of London disapproved of my “adaptation” of Roman books. I would have altered anything which I knew his Lordship to disapprove of, as departing, if he so thought, from the English Church. But *in these adaptations I admitted whatever I believed to be true*, believing it also *not to be contrary to the teaching of the Church of England*: in the Devotions of the Sisters there is *nothing but what is countenanced and sanctioned in principle by the Church of England*. *There is nothing to which any objection could be made by any one, unless it were that it is taken from the Roman Breviary, and that our English Prayer-book has in common*. It surely cannot be made an objection to a thing, in itself wholly unobjectionable, that it is used by a body of other Christians. One of Doddridge’s hymns is printed in very many of our Prayer-books.’

Thus, with regard both to the rule and the devotions of the Sisterhood, Pusey was acting on the principles of the English Church when claiming, as the best Anglican writers had claimed, that the spiritual endowments of the whole Catholic Body belong to the English portion of it no less than to the rest.

The Sisters wore a distinctive dress. Nowadays no one thinks more of it than of a clergyman’s black coat or a soldier’s uniform. But fifty years ago it was a novelty, and was regarded, even by some sensible people, with dislike and apprehension. Pusey had seriously to defend this practice. Six months after the opening of the Sisterhood, in Nov. 1845, there was a temporary revulsion of feeling among the poor in the neighbourhood against the Sisters. They began to regard Mr. Dodsworth and the Sisters as ‘disguised Roman Catholics.’ They gave up attendance at the services at Christ Church. Mr. Dodsworth was alarmed, and set himself to consider how the rising prejudice could be best disarmed. He thought that it was partly due to the dress worn by the Sisters and suggested modifications. Pusey did not welcome the suggestion. He thought it would be a pity to sacrifice to mere prejudice a regulation which had so much in reason to recommend it, and

to 'put the Sisters into a disguise.' In the end the Sisters' dress was very slightly altered.

The practice of the Sisterhood with respect to matters bearing more immediately on bodily health is described by Pusey to Mr. Hope as of 'extreme simplicity.'

'They have all which is necessary, good food, warm clothing, firing; and as Holy Scripture says, "having food and raiment, are therewith content." Some of them, you know, although of the rank of clergymen's daughters, had nothing of their own: and, being themselves supported by others, they could not wish to have mere superfluities. But real care is taken of their health. They keep the Fast of the Church: but their mode of keeping them is regulated by a physician, and is not so strict as that of some was before they went there. There is nothing distinctive, except great simplicity; but their general diet was regulated by the same kind physician.'

There was of course a real danger that, in their ardour and in the general inexperience of ascetic life, the Sisters might attempt to practise mortifications to which their bodily strength was unequal. Pusey's moral sympathy with all forms of self-sacrifice may have made him, at the early date to which we refer, less alive than he afterwards became to the necessity of checking ascetic excesses in the Sisters. Writing many years afterwards to a Sister on the subject, Pusey observes, 'Formerly we had to learn our experience about the effect of fasting; physicians too.' But it is quite clear that from the beginning Pusey at any rate was not unaware of the danger arising from unwise excesses in the direction of asceticism. He was not a rigorist at Park Village: indeed Mr. Dodsworth questioned whether the rules were not too much relaxed.

The following sketch of the ordinary daily routine of this, the first Sisterhood, is interesting. The institution had not been open for three weeks when one of its members, Sister Anne, whom we have before met with as Miss Jane Ellacombe, described her life to her father as follows:—

17 Park Village West, April 11, 1845.

... I am now, thank God, getting very well and strong again, and we are very happy—we three. Our district is in the worst part of Mr. Dodsworth's district—where there are a great many low Irish

people. They give away a great deal here to the poor, but there is such a great deal of misery and excessive poverty amongst our people. I call that our district, for it has no other regular visitors except the clergy, but wherever there is any distress made known to us we are to go, though, while few, Fitzroy Place will suffice us I think for some time. The people are all very glad and thankful at our coming to them—and we have not met with anything like a word of rudeness. We go to them to relieve their bodily wants, but principally our office lies in religious instruction and guidance as far as God gives us help. We do not find (though you will say we have not had a long trial) that we have too long a time for visiting; it is about a quarter of an hour's walk from home, besides which we have plenty of exercise in going up and down stairs to the different floors. We are out from 9 till 1, and again after dinner from a little after 3 till 5. The recreation hours are from a quarter to 2 till 3, and from 7 till 8. Except then, unless for some urgent cause and after leave given, of course we do not see any one who might kindly come to the Home. Mr. Dodsworth is very kind. He orders us all about our visiting: we do not know any one else but Mrs. Dodsworth and one other lady, beside Dr. Crawford. Would you be so kind as to send me my 'Pearson on the Creed,' which I left behind me to be sent afterwards, and please not to direct to me by any name, but only 17 Park Village West. Everything of that sort is common property, of books I mean; and of course we are no longer known as Miss this or Miss that; the number of the house is quite enough for any direction; it will be easy enough to know who it is for. We live in a very quiet place; the house does not join any other; and there is very little passing.

Now, my dearest papa, I must say good-bye. With my best love to dear mama and my dear brothers and sisters, and love to Mary and all kind friends,

Believe me to remain,

Your very thankful and affectionate child,

J. J. ELLACOMBE.

The work in which the Sisters were to engage had been sketched by the Committee. They began as we have seen to visit the poor in the neighbourhood of the Regent's Park. They went from house to house and from room to room in the most crowded parts of the thickly-populated districts of that part of London. But after a time they gave up house-to-house visiting, as it was generally known among the poor that they would gladly go wherever they were wanted. They were too few to do more; their whole time was filled up by attendance on the sick poor, and in visiting

those to whom they were sent by the parochial clergy. Soon 'even rough hard-looking men recognized them as "sisters of mercy"'; and they were called in to cases of sorrow or distress. One poor person sent them to another; and they had to economize their scanty resources—to lend linen when they would gladly have given it, and to lend much less than was needed for efficient relief.

Besides visiting the poor the Sisters set on foot a Ragged School, for those children who were too poor or too dirty to be taken into the National School at Christ Church.

'The Ragged School,' wrote Pusey, reviewing the work after two years' experience, "has been a great blessing. I must have told you of the case in which, on beginning the Prayers, a little boy stood up and said, "Father told me never to kneel." The father was an infidel; the child was made a Christian. There have been other cases, in which unbaptized children, growing up, were prepared for Baptism, and gave proofs afterwards in their life, of Baptismal grace. Their "Ragged School," you know, consists of children not fit to be received into the National School. . . . These children, taken often from bad and careless families, when they were fitted to go to the National School, have been remarked on by teachers there, as the best children. I told you perhaps a story which shows how much the Sisters are loved. Lately an arch of the house gave way. No harm happened: the house was propped up. But in their district, the report was that "the house had given way, and they must all have been killed, but that they were such good people." But, indeed, one hears abundantly how much they are beloved.'

One effect of the Ragged School was the improvement that became visible in the families where the children attended it. The Sisters gradually won the hearts of the parents through their kindness to the children, and thus the school was a missionary power in the older generation as well as a source of instruction and civilization to the younger.

During Pusey's visits to London he did what he could to strengthen the hands of the Sisters, by taking part, as far as he could, in their work. But he felt that for such a work, they required all the spiritual comfort and strength which a well tested Rule and life of devotion could give; and that what this Rule and life should ultimately

be, was a most anxious question only to be determined after much prayer, study, and experience.

The establishment of the Sisterhood, in its inchoate and tentative form, provoked, as Pusey had anticipated, much discussion on the part of young Churchwomen and their parents respecting the claims of such a life, the nature of a vocation to it, and the circumstances in which other duties might or might not be set aside in order to accept it.

One of the many letters which Pusey had to write may here be given as illustrating his view of the subject.

E. B. P. TO REV. E. T. RICHARDS.

Vigil of the Ascension, 1845.

. . . The Sisterhood of Mercy . . . will both awaken the desire to join it in some, and meet the desire already existing in others. And there will often be difficulty between seemingly conflicting duties. I think, however, that it will be as much on the part of parents as of children; the difficulty is (the whole subject being so new to us) to see whether any individuals have a real call to a more devoted life, as we hope we have to enter into Holy Orders. We should not oppose a son, who, after some preparation of mind, felt himself drawn to go as a missionary, although it perhaps involves parting with him for life; we think nothing of a daughter's marrying, although it breaks all ties; indeed parents, with some sorrow at the parting, still think it a subject of congratulation that their daughter is settled, so as to be happy. The real difficulty (I have felt for years) will be for parents to be convinced that their children will be happy so, while it is thus untried. And yet it is a very happy life; those whom I have seen looked very peaceful and had a holy calm about them, and the little Oratory of the little Sisterhood in London I could well think the most peaceful place in the whole of London. Those who are there (Jane Ellacombe among them) are happier than they ever were before. Jane E. is very happy and calm. She is a very superior person. . . . I should think too that parents might feel in some cases that their daughters would not be likely or would not wish to marry, and so would be glad that after their departure they should have so happy a home. The widow of a Scotch Bishop told me this of her daughters: they had long wished for this life, and she was glad that they should have hereafter so peaceful a home. The difficulty, as you say, will be in the lifetime of parents, and this again will be different according to the number of children, the age of parents, occupations, &c., how much they would be missed, &c. For it very seldom happens that a family like Miss ——'s remain together. Sons go into professions and

leave home ; daughters are married. I do not see that there can be any general rule. Again, in many families, e.g. where they live much in London, a daughter is compelled to live a miserably useless life, which drives them to marriage, and so they leave their parents' home at last. I heard lately of a young person, engaged to be married, but who said that had she known of an actual Sisterhood in our Church she should never have made the engagement. I know one whose married life is not a happy one, and whose early longings were to be a Sister of Charity, had there been any opening. I hear of others.

Now, especially, there is a great drawing of minds that way, so that I cannot doubt that it is of God : it has sprung up in different minds, apart from each other. One cannot doubt from past history that individuals are so drawn as God calleth, one this way, another that.

What, then, I should think the best in every such case would be for parent and child to pray to know what is God's will. If a longing were to last for some time steadily, and the person so drawn were to improve during that time, so that it should seem that, in other respects she were led by the grace of God, then a parent might the rather think that this too was given by him. It is sometimes very difficult to say. In one case, I have been for two or three years restraining a young person, a clergyman's daughter, where the father is in advanced years, and she the only child remaining at home ; and yet the mother being there too, I can hardly satisfy myself that this exceedingly strong drawing ought not to be followed ; i.e. that it would not be better if the father gave his consent and blessing. One of the three in London is (between ourselves) a Bishop's daughter (not English), who has given his consent, as being the best for his daughter.

I should think that the best way, generally speaking, would be to wait and pray, and see how God's Providence seemed to lead things. I am quite sure that these institutions would be a great blessing both to individuals and to the Church ; that there is an ardent spirit rising up in our Church which needs them ; that it will be best regulated in them (I feel sure that Mr. E[llacombe] hereafter will be very thankful that his daughter has entered one) ; and that ardent minds will so be kept most safely in our Church. I know minds whose great temptation to leave our Church for that of Rome has been, that we have not these institutions, and are stayed and quieted by the prospect of them. This is a long explanation, but your note seemed to invite it. The subject has been in my mind these many years ; indeed, five years ago, my dear Lucy learnt from me the desire to be, in the language of the Fathers, '*Sponsa Christi*' ; it was her one most animating wish, and now what she longed for, she has found. May we all find Him by Whom we have been sought and found.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

The experiment at Park Village led, as was natural, to attempts at imitating it. More than one clergyman thought that he might 'start a Sisterhood' just as he would institute a coal-club, with a view to better carrying out his own duties to his parishioners; and Pusey was asked for counsel and assistance. His experience had taught him that the foundation and growth of a Sisterhood must be a matter of much prayer, study, toil, and time; that it is mainly due to a higher than human agency; that a clergyman may be an excellent parish priest, and yet entirely without the knowledge or characteristics which would enable him to promote the foundation of such an institution. He was inclined to discourage entirely the tendency to multiply small local Sisterhoods; and of late years the wisdom of this advice has been generally recognized.

E. B. P. TO REV. D. S. [AFTERWARDS ARCHDEACON] GOVETT.

Oxford, Dec. 1, 1855.

. . . I think that the plan of clergy 'forming Sisterhoods' is an amiable mistake. Of course the clergy can help. . . Many can carry on a work: few can begin it. Sisters can only be trained in a Sisterhood: and, if God gives the increase, future Superiors would come best from the training in existing Sisterhoods. . . I believe that our best way, if God gives us the ability, would be ourselves to go into the streets and lanes of the city, and compel them to come in. Then we should understand better what the life of a Sister of Mercy is. But especially we should train ourselves, if we would know how to train others.

People would not so readily find fault with rules or with people, if they had felt the difficulties for which those rules are framed.

If I had had no duties here, and had fluency, I would long ago have asked leave to preach in the alleys of London, where the Gospel is as unknown as in Thibet.

God be with you.

Yours most faithfully,

E. B. P.

CHAPTER II.

RELATIONS WITH BISHOP WILBERFORCE—FIRST UNIVERSITY SERMON AFTER SUSPENSION.

1845-1846.

ALMOST coincident in point of time with Newman's departure, was the appearance on the scene of Oxford life of the gifted prelate who was destined to have many and various relations with Pusey in the years that followed. Five days after Newman joined the Church of Rome, Samuel Wilberforce, then Dean of Westminster, received a letter from Sir Robert Peel, announcing that Bishop Bagot had accepted the see of Bath and Wells, then vacant by the death of Bishop Law, and offering him, with the Royal assent, the see of Oxford.

It was understood that Dr. Bagot was anxious to be relieved of a position, the difficulties of which would have taxed the resources of a man of much greater knowledge and resolution, although, generally speaking, they could hardly have been met by more courtesy and consideration than his. To Pusey in particular the withdrawal of Bishop Bagot was a most serious loss. Notwithstanding the deep disappointment caused by the Bishop's Charge about Tract 90, Pusey had for many years sought and found at his hands sympathy and confidence, and such practical assistance as the Bishop could conscientiously give him. 'We may have a cleverer man,' said Pusey, 'but we are hardly likely to have a more fatherly Bishop.'

Dr. Wilberforce, although like his brothers, Robert and Henry, an Oriel man, had been less intimately connected than they with the Oxford Movement. He had been in all senses less influenced by Oxford; not being a Fellow of his Collège, he had gone down into the country after his

ordination, and, although he had to a considerable extent diverged from the strict Evangelicalism of the Clapham School in which he had been brought up, he still retained much of its phraseology and sentiment: Mr. Keble had once truly predicted that such influences would cling to him to the end of his life. He was well versed in religious literature, if not so deep a theologian as his elder brother Robert; he was as versatile as his younger brother Henry; and he possessed practical ability in a far higher degree than either of them. This ability had been trained and developed by his work as a parish priest and as an energetic archdeacon; but even so great a gift had less to do with his power of influencing men than a very sympathetic nature, which sought for and inspired the warm regard of all who really knew him. The importance of such an appointment to the see of Oxford was generally recognized; it could not but affect Pusey very intimately.

Pusey and Bishop Wilberforce resembled each other in the fact that, among the elements of their character, affection predominated; but the circumstances of their lives were as different as possible. Although not without experience of men and affairs, Pusey had been a student all his life: and the world of books was to him a very real world, in which he felt thoroughly at home. Bishop Wilberforce, on the other hand, used to say, 'God has set me to deal not with books, but with men.' Each was probably at times impatient of the other's way of looking at life and conduct: though at times they met on the ground which was entirely common to both.

Wilberforce was only five years younger than Pusey; but at the University five years represents more than a whole generation. Pusey was academically distinguished when his future bishop became a member of Oriel College; and Wilberforce carried with him into the country the Oxford estimate of Pusey's learning and capacity, and the recollection of his personal kindness. In 1836 the clergy of his rural deanery had resolved that the laws of 'prae-munire' as affecting the election and consecration of Bishops

were 'unchristian'; and that an agitation for their repeal ought to be set on foot. But before doing anything, Mr. Wilberforce wrote to ask Pusey for information.

REV. S. WILBERFORCE TO E. B. P.

Freemantle, Aug. 20, 1836.

. . . Will you let me ask you your opinion of the laws, as at present existing, of the best mode of attacking them—of the *practical* points we should at once endeavour to achieve—e.g. whether we should go one step beyond petitioning for the repeal of the *praemunire* laws, or content ourselves with that—whether such an attempt can be a movement for separating more effectually Church and State, which we as citizens should of course hold to be unlawful—where I can get the best information and arguments upon the matter so as to be thoroughly up to the subject when discussed at the Chancellor's Visitation.

I shall feel particularly obliged to you for such and such speedy answers to my questions as you are able to send me. I trust that your trouble will not be entirely thrown away—as the *praemunire* enactments appear to me one of the salient points of all our evil limitation of the system of the Church, and one which must give way to lawful agitation.

Believe me to remain, my dear Pusey,

Most truly yours,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

Five months later Mr. Wilberforce writes again to Pusey, and with an object which was characteristic of many of the efforts of his later life. He wished to make such changes in the Pastoral Aid Society as would induce Oxford High Churchmen to support it.

REV. S. WILBERFORCE TO E. B. P.

33 Grosvenor Square, Jan. 23, 1837.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

You will, I hope, excuse my troubling you with a few lines to ask you if you can let me know exactly what alteration of the Rules of the Pastoral Aid Society would give it such a character as would make you able to support it.

I suppose it to be (1) that they should give up all lay agency; (2) that they should divest themselves of the character of doctrinal judges of the Curates whose salaries they supply. . . . That is to say, that they may on the nomination of a Curate require to be satisfied by testimonials of his good character, but that this being done they do not pretend to exercise any superintendence over him but leave this to his Bishop.

Is there anything more? I do not ask this from mere curiosity, but

because one influential member of the Society has just applied to me to know what alterations of the Rules would recommend it to the support of 'our Oxford friends,' with a view if possible of persuading the Society to adopt them.

As the question is to be adjusted to-morrow week, I should feel much obliged to you if you would let me hear from you on the subject as soon as you can.

Believe me to remain, my dear Pusey,

Most sincerely yours,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

These relations, however, did not prevent an early and widening divergence between the future Bishop of Oxford and the leaders of the Oxford School. In 1838 Wilberforce was Select Preacher before the University; and, without naming Pusey, attacked the teaching of the latter on post-baptismal sin, as set out in his Tract on Baptism¹. In consequence of this, and of another sermon containing 'hits' at Newman, Newman declined in July, 1838, to receive further contributions from Wilberforce to the *British Critic*²; and it was impossible for Pusey at the time to conceal his vexation at the position which Wilberforce was taking up³.

For a moment this growing divergence of feeling was arrested by the death of Mrs. S. Wilberforce, on March 10, 1841. Two years had not yet passed since Pusey himself became a widower: and his own sorrow, deep and abiding, enabled him to enter with warm sympathy into the grief of a younger man. In nothing did Pusey's genuine character come out more clearly than in his letters to those in bereavement; they were the unaffected, unconventional outpouring of his own inner experiences, illuminated by the consolations of religion, and they never failed to draw towards him the hearts of those to whom they were addressed. Pusey's letter is the only one which Wilberforce mentions in his diary, among the 'many' that he received on the day of the funeral⁴. He wrote, on that very day, to express his warm gratitude.

¹ 'Letters of J. B. Mozley,' pp. 73, 74.

² 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' vol. i. p. 125.

³ 'Letters of J. B. Mozley,' p. 74.

⁴ 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' i. 181.

ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE TO E. B. P.

MY DEAR PUSEY, The Close, Winchester, March 17, 1841.

Thank you very sincerely for your kindness in thinking of me and writing to me in this hour of my deep distress. I thank you also for the whole tone of your letter. It expresses exactly that at which, in great weakness and confusion, I am endeavouring to aim. It does seem to me that such a blow should usher in a wholly different sort of life; and I dread nothing so much as starting back into worldly or easier schemes.

I would most seriously entreat you to pray for me and for the five poor children who have lost they know not what.

I cannot write about it; but I feel your kindness in writing, and am ever,

My dear Pusey, most sincerely yours,

S. WILBERFORCE.

But in a time of so much public excitement, it was not unnatural that the sympathies which Pusey's letter had evoked were lost sight of a few months later amidst the rush of Oxford controversy. The struggle for the Poetry Professorship in the late autumn of 1841 seems to have precipitated Archdeacon Wilberforce into a more defined opposition to the Oxford School than he had consciously taken up to that time. In a remarkable letter to Sir George Prevost, he states his reasons for voting against Rev. Isaac Williams and for Mr. Garbett, the Low Church candidate; and, among these, he places first 'Pusey's unhappy letter¹.' He

'felt daily obliged more and more, from love of the truth as I saw it, from love to our Church whose principles and very life I believe this teaching threatens, with formality and Romanism on the one hand, and a colder formality and Dissent (by its revulsion) on the other, to take on all occasions a position of more direct opposition to the School than I had of old thought necessary, being content before to feel that whilst I honoured their zeal, and was abashed by their holiness, and joined heartily in much Church truth they had brought forward, I was myself of another school of opinion and feeling².'

The years which followed illustrated this resolve. He came up to Oxford in October, 1844, to vote for Dr. Symonds as Vice-Chancellor: and in the great struggle of the

¹ See vol. ii. p. 263.

² Letter to Sir G. Prevost, 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' i. 205.

following February he had no doubt of the duty of punishing Ward; although he was deeply convinced of the 'inexpediency' of the attempt to condemn Tract 90. He disapproved of Pusey's sermon on the Eucharist, not as 'putting forward the Transubstantiation view,' but as 'a sort of misty exaggeration of the whole truth which is very likely to breed in others direct errors,' and 'in *tone* un-Anglican.' He described 'Avrillon's Mode of keeping Lent, with an Introduction by Pusey,' as being 'fuller of sad and humiliating bits of superstition than anything of his' he had yet seen. One of his letters¹, written immediately after the consecration of St. Saviour's, gives in fullest confidence the estimate which he had formed of Pusey during those trying weeks which followed Newman's secession, when he himself was Bishop-designate of Oxford.

DR. WILBERFORCE TO MISS NOEL.

Nov. 9, 1845.

I must say a word or two about Pusey. I quite believe him to be a very holy man. I could sit at his feet. But then I see that he is, if I understand God's Word aright, most dark as to many parts of Christ's blessed Gospel. *He* now, Henry says, acknowledges, that what *I* said of old in 1837, of his 'Sin after Baptism' view, was quite true. I see that he has greatly helped, and is helping, to make a party of semi-Romanizers in the Church, to lead some to Rome, to drive back from sound views those amongst us who love Christ, for another half century, and to make others grovel in low unworthy views of their Christian state, trembling always before an hard Master, thinking dirt willingly endured holiness, &c. Now there must be *some cause* why so good a man should fall into such fearful errors and do such deep mischief, and that cause, I believe, is a great want of humility, veiling itself from his eyes under the appearance of entire abasement. I see it in all his writings and doings. His last letter about Newman I think deeply painful, utterly sophistical and false. He says, for instance, that he does not think himself as an English Churchman at liberty to hold all Roman doctrine; but he does '*not* censure any Roman doctrine,' whilst he holds his Canonry at Ch. Ch., and his position among *us*, on condition of signing Articles, one-half of which are taken up in declaring different figments of Rome to be dangerous deceits and blasphemous fables. Then his language about the Church of England, patronizing, fault-finding, apologetic; his evident assumption of the position of

¹ See 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' i. 311.

head of the party since Newman's secession; this very Leeds self-appointed Holy Week; his letter to his own Bishop—all seem to me full of egotistic assumption. I am called abruptly to dinner.

The last words of this passage will show that it was written hurriedly, and therefore must not be criticized too closely. The whole letter shows that, in spite of his appreciation of Pusey's goodness, he was at this time strongly opposed to both the position Pusey occupied and his method of defending it. Such hostility partly arose no doubt from the prejudices previously alluded to, of his early training. But these were reinforced by more recent intimacies with the leaders of the Low Church and Latitudinarian parties. His intimates of that day, Bishop Sumner, Chevalier Bunsen, F. D. Maurice, and his relations with the Court, as a chaplain to Prince Albert, show that he was not likely heartily to sympathize with the Catholic truths which Pusey was reviving, or the type of Christian life he was helping to develop. Besides, it was a moment when very few even of those who were most intimate with Oxford understood Pusey's position. There was a widespread expectation that he would follow Newman's example in seceding: his utterances were interpreted in that sense, and his professions to the contrary fell on deaf ears. Even Newman had for a moment misinterpreted his apparent hesitation. It is little surprising then if one whose sympathies had drifted so far away from the Oxford School, shews little appreciation of the soundness of Pusey's theological ground, and of the difficulties with which he had to contend. At any rate this letter, though with some inconsistency, expresses a definitely hostile judgment, which must be kept in view, as a factor in the situation, during the ten years which followed on the events of 1845.

Pusey on his part was entirely unconscious that he was so severely misjudged; he seems to have thought of Bishop Wilberforce as of a younger friend, from whom he had been unhappily estranged by the course of recent controversies, but whose accession to the post of chief pastor in the diocese warranted him in furnishing such

information and suggestions as would not be likely to be forthcoming from any other quarter.

Accordingly on Nov. 15, 1845,—the day on which he had himself joined with the rest of the Chapter of Christ Church in the election of the Bishop,—Pusey wrote to his future Diocesan. The purpose of his letter—as he himself has stated in later years—was to convey to the new Bishop information ‘which might be useful to him and to the Church’—information not respecting the Oxford movement generally, but with reference to ‘a definite class of minds.’ He refers of course in this expression to the men who had not followed Newman, but were deeply perplexed by his secession, and who were for the time mainly reassured by Pusey’s own steadfastness. It seemed to Pusey vitally important that these should be retained in the Church if possible: at least it was beyond all things desirable that the new Bishop should understand their perplexities. Pusey’s letter was an offer of explanations which no one else could supply, and which he might reasonably assume would be welcomed by its recipient.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP-ELECT OF OXFORD.

MY DEAR LORD,

You will, I suppose, by the same post receive the official address, requesting you, I think, to undertake the office of Bishop of this diocese. It was a solemn and touching form which we went through in your election to-day, showing what our relation to a Bishop should be.

I could not write at first, being very much pressed for the sermons for Leeds, and you would have felt a letter of congratulation very misplaced. A letter of sympathy is perhaps what you would have looked for from me. It does seem strange, and is, I think, a token of God’s mercy, that whereas some of the offices of a Bishop would seem fitted to your natural gifts, you should by God’s appointment have been called to a see which most of all requires supernatural. I hear privately from your brother Henry that you feel it so; and so I may the more venture to express my sympathy with you. One hopes the more that any one will be an instrument in the hands of God, when he feels himself unequal to the office whereto he is called, and so depends the more wholly on Him Who by His providence has called him.

It is indeed a time of intense anxiety; we have scarcely seen the beginning of the troubles with which we are threatened. I fear that the unsettlement is exceeding great, and that there are lurking seeds

of doubt very often where nothing comes to the surface. A little while ago people seemed inclined to give up everything out of mere dejectedness. Of course such a loss as we have just had must be intensely painful and perplexing to thousands who owe all their religious being to his preaching, or published sermons. Then each unhinges another, and so it spreads until one sees not where it is to end. As far as I can see, what is chiefly at work is, not attraction towards Rome, but despondency about ourselves.

I can well suppose that you, in common with many others, will have been surprised, and perhaps pained, at the line which I have myself taken. I felt, as I have heretofore, that I must risk everything if I was to do anything. I did feel that there was a strong definite position to take in positive attachment to our own Church, and awe at His presence Who has guarded her by His providence, and blessed her with His grace, apart from every other question. Love is the real element that binds; not antagonism. I have been led to this by the experience of perplexed minds for many years; I found that controversy irritated and had no good effect whatever upon them; sometimes an hour's controversy with others undid all I had been doing by the irritation which it caused; on the other hand, I found that the sense of God's gifts in our Church made them calm and happy.

I did not intend to write so much about myself. It is, I fear, misplaced when you have so many solemn thoughts about yourself and your approaching consecration. Yet you will have distractions, else I would not have broken in upon you; and I hope that anything which brings before you more vividly our perils may, so far from distracting you, rather promote that frame of mind which you would now most wish to cherish—mistrust of self and full trust in God.

I know not whether my own sense of our perils has not been deepened by knowing of the sort of persons, lay or clerical, who have been comforted by my Letters¹. Still I have all hope, both in God's good providence which has been over our Church hitherto, and in the actual tokens around us, especially our young persons, and in the deepened frame of mind and reverence so widely visible. But I am sure that, in this diocese, it will need all the wisdom which any can obtain to rule aright the Church of God.

Yet God's providence has been so wonderfully shown in the character of the Bishop whom He has given us these last sixteen years, and now again in our not having one such as some with whom we have been threatened, that I trust that your coming here is an act of the same graciousness, and the more, from the little which your brother H[enry] has told me.

For myself, I can too readily think that any apparent connexion

¹ The reference is to the four letters to the *English Churchman* about Oakeley and about Newman's secession. See vol. ii. pp. 440, 460-463. This letter

to Bishop Wilberforce, as well as that of Nov. 27, is copied from 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' i. 300-306.

with myself would rather embarrass you with many; else it would have given me much pleasure if, in the retired way in which I live, my house could be of any service to you at any time that your duties should call you into Oxford.

I wish my prayers were more such as I might hope would be heard for you.

Wishing you all blessing, I would remain,

Yours most faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church, Nov. 15, [1845].

P.S.—I have written this as to a future Bishop, I know not whether in ignorance; to an actual Bishop its style must have been different.

More than a week elapsed before the Bishop-elect replied.

THE BISHOP-ELECT OF OXFORD TO E. B. P.

Private.

Alverstoke Rectory, Nov. 24, 1845.

MY DEAR DR. PUSEY,

Your letter has remained unanswered until now from the difficulty I felt in replying to it. I cannot reply to it without a cordial acknowledgment of the kindness of its tone towards myself, and an earnest return of its desire for our beloved Church, of a hearty, faithful, truthful peacefulness of inward spirit. At the same time, I cannot say this without adding what I feared might pain you (this is what kept me silent), and that perhaps the more because anything I say must be incomplete and abrupt, since it would be plainly impossible if it was not, as it is, unfit that we should enter into a correspondence upon the subject.

I could not then but say how very deeply (to go no further back) the Letters to which you allude had pained me, and that I cannot feel that the language therein held as to the errors of the Church of Rome is to my apprehension to be reconciled with the doctrinal formularies of our own reformed Church. In saying this I speak I know as you would have me, with entire frankness, and so I would leave the subject.

In one point at least we can agree entirely—in our sense of the greatness of the common danger, and of the extremity of my own;—and for the prayers and intercessions you promise me I thank you from the bottom of my soul.

I am ever, my dear Dr. Pusey, most sincerely yours,

S. OXON (Elect).

P.S. I had written 'Private'; but I erase it, as upon consideration I should prefer having my opinion on the subjects touched on in this letter as widely known as possible. My address will be the Deanery, Westminster.

S. O.

It was a disagreeable surprise for one in Pusey's anxious position, entertaining as he had done such hopeful expecta-

tions, to receive thus early a plain intimation that the attitude of his future Bishop was so different from all that he had anticipated, as well as from that of the previous occupant of the See. Dr. Bagot had never questioned either Pusey's theological judgment or his unswerving faithfulness to the Church of England. Pusey lost no time in replying, with the unguarded candour of conscious loyalty. So far from retreating from the attitude taken up in the Letters to which the Bishop objected, he insisted on, if he did not extend it.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP-ELECT OF OXFORD.

MY DEAR LORD,

Nov. 27, 1845.

Your mentioning your address seems to imply that you thought I might wish to write again to you, and so I take occasion to explain myself further upon one point. I did not mean in my last Letter [to the *English Churchman*] to say anything definite as to my own belief, except simply that I received all which the Ancient Church received, and that in so doing I believed that I was following the guidance of my own and of God by her. I did not mean to state anything definitely as to myself, but only to maintain, in the abstract, the tenability of a certain position, in which very many are, of not holding themselves obliged to renounce any doctrine *formally* decreed by the Roman Church. And this I knew would satisfy many minds, who do not wish to form any definite opinions on those doctrines, yet still wish not to be obliged to commit themselves against them.

But in this I was not speaking of what is commonly meant by 'Popery,' which is a large practical system, going beyond their formularies, varying perhaps indefinitely in different minds. I meant simply 'the *letter* of what has been decreed by the Roman Church'; and this I have for years hoped might ultimately become the basis of union between us.

And now I hope you will not object to hear how this does seem to me consistent with subscription to our formularies, although it is no other than I said in my defence of Tract 90.

The ground on which I rest is that since our Church, both by the declarations of the Reformers, by her Canons, and by the combined teaching of approved divines, refers to Antiquity, the early Church, the *quod ubique*, &c.—then in receiving what is so taught, I am following the teaching of my Church. If then anything in our formularies seems, according to any received interpretation, to be at variance with that teaching, I think myself compelled, on her own principles, to inquire whether these formularies necessarily require that interpretation. If, of two interpretations, one goes against Antiquity, while the other falls in with it, I think that I am acting on the principles of

our Church in adopting that which falls in with it, and interpreting her in harmony with Antiquity to which she appeals.

It is in this way that I have received everything which I have received. Whatever I have received, I received on the authority of the Ancient Church. I may say, too, I received some things against my will. My bias was to keep the position which those in our Church had usually held. I have mentioned the change in myself to *very* few; because what I had at heart was simply the revival of holiness and true faith among ourselves, and I trusted that God in His mercy giving us this 'would provide' for the rest. Practically, when people come to me for guidance, I endeavour to withhold them from what lies beyond our Church, although, if asked on the other side, I could not deny that such and such things seem to me admissible.

If I may explain my meaning, the remarkable Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, which were beyond question genuine, contains a very solemn vision, which involves the doctrine of process of purification after death by suffering, to shorten which prayer was available. I came upon it while reading the Acts for another purpose: it was great pain to me. The ground was taken from under me. I had interpreted passages (as of St. Basil), as I saw wrongly, under a bias the other way; solemn as it was I could not, taking all together, refuse my belief to an intermediate state of cleansing, in some cases through pain. The history was a revelation, at a very solemn time, to a martyr; falling in with much which *might* be the meaning of Holy Scripture and very much in the Fathers, and stamping it upon my mind. I could not escape it. The effect has been that I have since been wholly silent about Purgatory (before I used to speak against it). I have not said so much as this except to two or three friends. Some of my nearest friends do not know it.

In like manner, I found that some Invocation of Saints was much more frequent in the early Church than I had been taught to think, that it has very high authority, and is nowhere blamed. This is wholly distinct from the whole system as to St. Mary, as what I before said is from the popular system as to purgatory. In this way, then, and partly from the internal structure of the Article [xxii], I came to think that our Article did not condemn *all* 'doctrine of Purgatory' or Invocation of Saints, but only a certain practical system; and then I came afterwards to see that the *actual* Roman *formularies* did not assert more on these subjects (as apart from the popular system or 'Popery') than was in the Ancient Church.

Practically then I dissuade or forbid (when I have authority) Invocation of Saints; abstractedly, I see no reason why our Church might not eventually allow it, in the sense of asking for their prayers.

I fear that by all this I shall distress you more than before: and yet it is well that you should know the state of our minds, and how we came to it. I have unshaken faith in our position; I believe that God's hand is with our Church and that all will come right. But

I cannot give up my implicit faith in the Ancient Church, nor limit my subscription to it. If our formularies were set authoritatively (i. e. by any interpretation of the English Church) at variance with the Ancient (which God forbid !), I should have to give up our formularies. I have full confidence that it will not be so.

I hardly know what my relation to yourself will be ; we seem in such an un-episcopal state ; electing you, it seems, in a very affecting and solemn way, as our own Bishop, and then, in no relation with the Bishop, when elected, except privately, or in concurrence with the Ordinations. I may therefore the rather speak what I know, that any declaration which should require people, by virtue of their subscription, to declare, upon the various subjects mentioned in our Articles, against the *letter* of the Roman decrees, would cause the loss of the labours of many valuable and devoted men. And I suppose it is not a wide step, now, between a person's being obliged to resign ministerial duty, and thinking that he has no more place in the Church of England.

I cannot but think (as I said) that it has been by God's providence, that in the Council of Trent the Bishops there assembled were withheld in so marked a manner from any condemnation of ourselves, and that our Articles, being drawn up before the Council, were not levelled against it. I cannot but think that Rome and we are not irreconcilably at variance, but that, in the great impending contest with unbelief, we shall be on the same side, and in God's time, and in His way, one.

However, I do not speculate on the future. The present is a time of intense anxiety though of hope. I am myself satisfied about my subscription ; in fact, it is no other than that of Keble and others perhaps nearer to yourself. I would willingly give up office, if I thought that my mode of subscription was not allowed ; but I have thought it better to satisfy my own conscience privately, than add to the confusion by speaking publicly on any controversial subject. I did not mean to say so much to you ; but as you spoke of your impression of the untenability of my mode of subscription, I thought I had best, even at the risk of making you place still less confidence in me, explain to you the state of other minds, over whom you will be placed in the Lord, by my own.

Forgive me any pain I give you, and believe me, yours very faithfully and humbly,

E. B. PUSEY.

It must be admitted that, if the object was to conciliate Bishop Wilberforce, Pusey had not taken the best course to secure it. He had reasserted, in its main features, the line which he had taken in defence of Tract 90, but without any such account or kind of explanation as would have recommended it to his correspondent. On the contrary

he had expressed himself in such terms as were not unreasonably calculated to increase the anxiety.

The Bishop, as was well known afterwards, was far from accepting the principle which was plain enough to Pusey, that Scripture itself could not be defended if the authority of Christian Antiquity was set aside. Apparently, also, he did not realize the great importance of Pusey's distinction between the *letter* of the Roman formularies and the *practical* Roman system; nor could he fall in with the principle that if the current interpretation of one of our own formularies contradicted Antiquity, another equally admissible interpretation, which was in harmony with Antiquity, must be preferred. Pusey's argument, so far from recommending itself to him, only convinced him that the estimate of Pusey which he had expressed to Miss Noel was substantially accurate. So, five days after his consecration, he replied to Pusey in terms which showed not only that, for some time to come at any rate, the old relations between the Oxford School and the Bishop of Oxford would be impossible, but also that Pusey should not be surprised if the Bishop (however little he understood the theological questions that were involved) openly pronounced judgment against him.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO E. B. P.¹

The Deanery, December 5, 1845.

MY DEAR DR. PUSEY,

My mind has been lately so entirely occupied in ways you will easily conceive, that I have been led to postpone for a few days replying to your last letter. There is, as you anticipated, much in it which is distressing to me. But before I very lightly touch on one or two of those points, I wish to say a word on the nature of the communication itself.

It seems to me to appertain strictly to the office to which God has called me, that I should seek to bear as a Father in Christ (however unworthy) the burden, not of these only, but of all the difficulties, infirmities, or temptations which may harass the minds of any who are entrusted (in whatever measure) to my charge and who wish to communicate with me. Such therefore I would always be ready to listen to, and if possible to aid, not by controversy, but by a true sympathy

¹ See 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' i. 307-309.

and by any practical counsels which God may enable me to offer. Only this must be borne in mind, that such communications stand wholly apart from any judgment or step which I may be compelled to pronounce or take by any public act, in which these same persons may embody the difficulties or errors which they have communicated to me, and from which I have sought by private counsel to withdraw them.

Having said so much, I would add that I am as far as possible from being unable to enter into the difficulties of which you speak. But I must also say that I trace our present difficulties to a different source, and look for our escape from them, if it please God, from a different quarter from those to which you point. I do not doubt that a longing after greater devotion, after a higher and more self-denying character, and after a greater life of Christian charity, than they met with around them, was the spring which originally moved many of those who have been foremost in the recent Movement. But I believe that instead of seeking for these, where only they could be found, in a fuller and more personal knowledge of God and the eternal relations of the ever-blessed Trinity as revealed in God's Word, they were drawn aside by forms and trappings which seemed to promise them that which they sought in a system which must really obscure the truth to all, and especially to those by whom it was self-chosen. Thus they were led from God instead of to Him. With the appearance to themselves of peculiar self-abasement they lost their humility; with great outward asceticism they were ruled by an unmortified will; they formed a party; and thus being greatly predisposed to it, the perverted bias of one master-mind has sufficed to draw them close to or absolutely into the Roman Schism, with all its fearful doctrinal errors.

The Bishop might have stopped at this point; since Pusey would have understood himself to be at any rate partly referred to in the sentence of his correspondent. But he proceeds:—

I should not speak as I have said that I would, if I did not add that there appear to me to be in yourself too many traces of this evil; of a subtle and therefore most dangerous form of self-will; and a tendency to view yourself as one in, if not now the leader of, a party. This seems to me to lead you to judge the Church which you ought to obey; sometimes to blame, sometimes almost to patronize her; and hence to fall into the further error of undervaluing the One inspired Revelation of God's will given to us in His perfect Word. I would suggest to you as instances, your abandoning what you had learned as a matter of Faith from your Church's exposition of God's Word on the evidence of an alleged vision, whereas the truth of no one of the Articles of the Faith rests on such evidence, an evidence manifestly open (as the mere facts of animal magnetism may show) to every form of uninten-

tional deceit. Again, the same spirit seems to me to be involved in your being ready to give up any one of our Formularies (which refer for their authority straight to God's Word and the Apostolical Creeds), if you, as an individual, think that you can find in early Christian writers contradictions of them.

Will you let me then pray you to weigh carefully the mere possibility of my views being right; and see as in God's sight whether you may not unawares have been led to foster the spirit of party, to shake the obedient reverence due to our Church, to lose sight in some measure of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, and so to hold great truths partially, and therefore untruly. Should you admit even the possibility of this being true, you will agree with me that not to take any new step, but to watch most earnestly against self-dependence and the spirit or acts of party, is at this moment your especial duty.

I have answered your appeal plainly: I believe that you would have me do so. Only let me further say how earnestly I pray that the God of Peace may Himself heal these our open wounds, and bring together into the clear light of His truth hearts which to His eye may be nearer than they seem to be to us. Should He make me His humble instrument in working such an end, my highest aim will be richly accomplished.

I am ever, my dear Dr. Pusey, your faithful friend and brother,

S. OXON.

Anything more unhappy than such a correspondence as this cannot well be imagined. At that moment it was most desirable that all who were really loyal to the cause of the Church of England should understand each other, and, if need were, exercise a generous tolerance in order the better to do so. It would have been indeed a gain if the two men, who by their position, gifts, and character were bound to sway the minds of a great number of Churchmen, could have been in sympathy with one another. But it was one of the greatest of the many serious misfortunes under which the Church of England then laboured, that at the very outset of Bishop Wilberforce's episcopate such unhappy relations should have been established between him and Pusey.

It is impossible to attempt to allot the share of the blame for such grave misunderstandings. It is evident enough that Pusey, in his somewhat hasty but single-minded anxiety to explain the whole position to his new Bishop, did unwittingly contribute to this unhappy state of things. It must

be allowed that, considering the many secessions that were occurring, there was sufficient in Pusey's letter to excite suspicion in the mind of one who had no closer sympathies with the Tractarian movement than had Dr. Wilberforce at that moment. On the other hand, Dr. Wilberforce had no doubt much more to learn than he supposed about the theological position of the Church of England, about the Oxford School, and about Pusey himself. And it was no good omen for the immediate future, that the new prelate, five days after his consecration, and before he had reached his diocese, should thus admonish one who was probably the most learned, and amongst the most saintly of his clergy, on a 'dangerous form of self-will,' and his 'tendency to party spirit,' and should exhort him as a special duty to watch most earnestly against 'self-dependence.' Only after the lapse of years, and after still graver misunderstandings between the two men, did the clouds so far clear away as to enable the Bishop not only to appreciate the drift of Pusey's efforts and his sincere loyalty to the English Church, but to invite his hearty co-operation in schemes for the welfare of the Church.

For the present, however, Pusey's public actions were no more calculated to improve his relations with his new Bishop than were his private letters. The two years of suspension from the duty of preaching in the University pulpit had expired in June, 1845; and Pusey had been for some time anxiously considering what would be the most useful subject for the sermon which he would soon have to preach. It was suggested to him that he should preach the condemned sermon over again, in order to compel the Heads of Houses to give him a real hearing. This project had been resisted by Marriott.

'If,' he wrote to Pusey on Oct. 19, 1844, 'by preaching the same sermon you call on the six doctors for another decision and a hearing, are you not forcing them for the sake of consistency into a position unfair to our poor Church? and is it not, at present at all events, *doubtful* whether they can be considered to have condemned any doctrine at all? Is it not but an attempt to wound us all through you, by seizing any opening for doing so? Do not their supporters generally

through the country allow that there is no wrong doctrine in the sermon, but [say] that it was injudicious, and that something must be done against us? I know of no one who condemns the doctrine. My notion is what Judge Coleridge says, that you cannot be placed in a better position than you now hold, but may be in a much worse. It [the sermon] has opened [a way for] the true doctrine more deeply and extensively than anything else could have done, into people's hearts, where it has carried it with sympathy for yourself.'

Newman had not then left the English Church, but he had lost all heart and hope in her. Pusey therefore turned to Keble for advice.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church,
Vigil of SS. Simon and Jude, 1844.

. . . It seemed to me that should I live to have another preaching-turn, I might preach the same doctrine over again, as gradually as I could, preaching the whole doctrine. This Newman seemed to think at once the best plan, and caught at it: 'It seems to me the best thing you have said.' But what is to be done, if I am again condemned? And yet it would be very uncomfortable to preach before the University, with this sort of stigma upon me, as though there were a subject upon which I had been judged unsound. I hardly see how I could go on with my course, as though nothing had happened. I had thought of taking for my text, 'The words that I speak unto you, &c.,' removing the heretical interpretation of the text, and inculcating the actual inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, as connected with the Holy Communion, which again brings us round to the high doctrine, and re-affirming the two doctrines at which people rebel, the Real Presence by virtue of the consecration, and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Tell me, at your leisure, pray, what you think.

Ever yours gratefully and affectionately,

E. B. P.

Keble's reply was, like himself, cautious and decided:—

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley, Nov. 19, 1844.

On turning over in my mind every way the case you put to me, what you should do when the two years are over, I cannot see that anything would be better than to go on in what might be called a natural way, i.e. to take up the subject where you left it off, recapitulate it as you naturally would do at such a distance of time, and in so doing of course re-assert the two great doctrines of the Sacrifice and Real Presence. This will give them an opportunity, if they think proper, of removing their censure, yet without undue

controversy or challenge on your part. And if they do not take it up, it will be equivalent to allowing the substance of what they before tried to silence. . . .

Ever, my very dear friend,

Your very affectionate

J. K.

As Newman's secession was soon expected, it was suggested to Pusey that it would be of real help if he resumed his place as a preacher before that event took place; it was hoped that his sermon might 'cheer' some waverers. But Isaac Williams and Copeland, as well as Keble, were against any attempt to preach before it came in the ordinary course; Pusey therefore decided to wait. Soon however after his return from the consecration of St. Saviour's, Leeds, he began to 'read' for a University sermon, which he was to preach in his own turn on February 1, 1846. Pusey, as has been already stated, prepared for a University sermon as seriously as for writing a book: it was generally three, or at least two months on the stocks; and, when delivered, it represented only a fragment of the wide investigations which had preceded it, and some of which survived in elaborate notes or an ample appendix.

The subject which Pusey chose was 'The Power of the Keys,' or, as it was described,—with a view to being introduced into the course which Pusey was working out in the University pulpit,—'The Entire Absolution of the Penitent.' His family were filled with anxiety at the prospect of a new sermon, and possibly of another suspension; and their apprehensions were shared, though for different reasons, by others.

ARCHDEACON MANNING TO E. B. P.

Lavington, Jan. 10, 1846.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

. . . Will you bear with me, and if what I say is superfluous, forgive me? I think you are sure to have a preaching-turn before the University: and from something you said to me once at Brighton I am led to think you have been inclined to take some subject under the view of bearing witness to the Truth. The more I have thought of it, and the more (without discussion on my part) I have gathered the opinions and feelings of others, the more I earnestly hope and

beg of you to treat of some subject in which those that watch for you may be disappointed. My reasons are more than I can hope now to give. It seems to me that Truth itself will be more jeopardized in many minds by a renewal of contests : that any new questions will seem like a personal retort on your part, wholly out of keeping with your past silence, which has been invaluable to you as an example : that it will savour of 'striving and lifting up,' which both for your sake and for those who oppose you seems to me a course which our Great Example would not warrant. Hardly anything could be so hurtful to us as that you should be again the centre of a public contest : or that people should seem to see you always associated with University conflicts. It appears to me that your work is with and for the Church eminently, and that to allow the University to intercept you by its narrow jurisdiction is most unhappy, and tending unspeakably to increase the doubt, irritation, unsettlement, and alienation of heart which is too prevalent already. . . . May you be guided with a sure and true light from our only Guide.

Believe me, my dear friend,

Yours very affectionately,

H. E. M.

The subject of the sermon had, however, been already settled. Pusey took the opportunity of pointing out to Manning how largely his earlier steps had been influenced by a desire to show such sympathy with Newman's state of mind as might help to retain him in the English Church, and that there were others for whom he now desired to do the same.

E. B. P. TO ARCHDEACON MANNING.

[Brighton, Jan. 11, 1846.]

MY DEAR FRIEND,

. . . The subject of my sermon is fixed for me : 'The Power of the Keys.' (1) It seemed most natural to go on with my course 'On the Comfort to Penitents' just as I should have done : (2) it has 'got out' that I am going to preach upon it, so that to give it up would be to imply some weakness somewhere. And then happily all our formularies are so decisively favourable, that there is no conceivable point of attack.

When dear N[ewman] was as yet undetermined, I did what I could with reference to him : sometimes to take off invidiousness from him, as in the defence of Tract 90 ; then in all I did about vindicating myself ; and my plan for this sermon was in hopes of taking off the edge of what he felt so keenly. The present form was suggested by K[eble] as the most natural. The execution is of course mine.

I should like to send you the whole if I have time. Will you tell me what you think of the enclosed? I do not like to gloss over the subject altogether, although I feel, as you do, the importance of avoiding attack. But I really do hope that at Oxford also they are impressed with the great seriousness of the present crisis, and desirous to commit things to God's hands, rather than take them into their own.

Thank you most truly for your prayer and for all your love for one unworthy. God requite it to you.

In Him your very affectionate

E. B. P.

Archdeacon Manning was only anxious that Pusey's statement should be full and systematic, defining what was intended to be included and to be excluded.

ARCHDEACON MANNING TO E. B. P.

Reigate, Jan. 13, 1846.

The point on which I should think a clear statement most needed is that which *practically* differences the Church of England from the Church of Rome—namely, the necessity of Confession to the forgiveness of penitents. It seems to me plain beyond doubt from such passages as Bingham brings to the point, that in the early centuries such a necessity was not supposed to exist; and that confession was not a necessary condition to Communion. This, I think, will be the point in which it will be necessary to be clear.

I am ashamed of writing in this way to you. . . .

Believe me, my dear friend,

Yours very affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

Another person was roused by the purport of Pusey's sermon. Mr. Golightly felt bound by his conception of his duty to come forward at such a crisis. He addressed a public letter to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Symons, drawing attention to Pusey's Letters to the *English Churchman* in October, 1845, and desiring that, before Pusey was allowed to preach, the Vice-Chancellor would require him to sign Article XXII. He then proceeds to discuss other passages in Pusey's works, his adaptation of Roman Catholic books to the use of the English Church, his defence of Oakeley, and the recent secessions to Rome, and to urge that 'Dr. Pusey may reasonably be called upon to consider very seriously whether he is again able to attach his *bonâ fide*

and *ex animo* subscription to the formularies of our Church.'

Replying to a letter of Mr. J. B. Mozley's, who wished him now to define his position as distinct from that of Oakeley, Pusey notices Golightly's letter to the Vice-Chancellor, and the course which he might deem it his duty to take with respect to it.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. B. MOZLEY.

Brighton, 131 Marine Parade, Jan. 10, 1846.

Many thanks for your kind anxiety about me. No hint has come to me in consequence of Golightly's letter. I hope anyhow to take warning by the private negotiations of two and a half years ago. . . .

If asked to sign the Articles, I think I must say something as to the mode in which I sign them: as, 'I sign them in the sense which I have so often explained, and which, although it differs Mr. V.-C. from yours, I believe to be the grammatical sense'; or the like, 'I sign the Articles in their grammatical sense apart from any interpretation put upon them.' But on this I must consult. I must not *seem* to take a test in a sense in which I do not take it. Everything depends on the appearance of honesty; *ab omni non solum facto, verum opprobrio quoque turpi*, while I am desirous not to give any handle against myself or others.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

Mozley replied at once:—

REV. J. B. MOZLEY TO E. B. P.

Oxford, Jan. 12, 1846.

Thank you for your kind note. I see Golightly in his letter expressly fixes upon you what you carefully avoided in your Letters in the *English Churchman*; viz. identifying yourself with Oakeley's ground. He makes you identify yourself. Perhaps this is an indication of the line they will take. The Provost will be sharp enough to see that you have not committed yourself, but I should not be surprised at some push being made to get the vacuum filled up in some way or other, and make out a regular case of identity.

Now, with respect to Oakeley's ground, I suppose one has not much more to do with it, now that Oakeley and those who put it forward have gone. I mean that there are no open supporters of it that one has to defend and sympathize with *ab extra*. So one seems to be injuring no one now by saying openly—I do not go on Oakeley's ground myself. This would set matters straight with many persons who [are] so very suspicious of us now. Not that it is necessary to go out of our way to say it; but if it comes in one's way one would

be ready to do so. I am going now on the supposition that Oakeley's ground is *in itself* untenable, which I suppose one must say it is, however one would have allowed him to hold it while he was in our Church.

I mean that with respect to subscription to the Articles one's public line is cleared, however one may regret the cause [of] it, by Oakeley's secession. It seems hardly possible to have anything more to do with his ground now, and one may relieve oneself of thinking anything more about it. And if we are pushed in that direction our answer is ready. I am speaking of course of our public line generally and not of any explanations to the V. C. or Hebdomadal Board.

In the *act* of subscribing, however, I suppose we have nothing to do with explanation one way or another. I say this with reference to what you throw out in your note. You will act of course on much better advice than mine in the matter, but it seems to me we should lose ground considerably by appending any kind of explanation to our *act of subscription*. Though it simply amounted to a truism (the sense which *I believe*, &c.) it would be taken for a dishonest reservation, and a concession on our part that we had not the same right to sign the Articles ἀπλῶς that others have. At least I should much fear so.

The Vice-Chancellor delayed his reply to Golightly until January 14. He expressed disapproval of Golightly's publishing his letter to himself while it was still under his consideration; and he had some doubt of the correctness of Golightly's reasoning in some instances. But, for the rest, he and his correspondent were of one mind. Golightly need not apologize for raising the question of requiring Dr. Pusey to subscribe the Articles: but the Vice-Chancellor had doubts whether anything would be gained by insisting on Dr. Pusey's subscription. He had observed that in the Letter to which Mr. Golightly made particular reference, Dr. Pusey not only plainly intimated his readiness to subscribe the Articles, but gave a studied exposition of the grounds on which subscription might be made. As these grounds were certainly very different from any that would have appeared satisfactory to the Vice-Chancellor and his correspondent, it seemed reasonable to conclude that the application of the Statute would in the present case be ineffectual, and being so would be worse than useless. At the same time, the Vice-Chancellor pointed out to his correspondent that 'if, unhappily,

erroneous doctrine should at any time be delivered from the pulpit of the University, the Statutes provide a remedy and one which cannot be rendered inoperative by an unsatisfactory subscription to the Articles.'

The Vice-Chancellor sent Pusey a copy of his reply to Mr. Golightly, and he accompanied it with the subjoined note :—

THE VICE-CHANCELLOR TO E. B. P.

Wadham College, Jan. 14, 1846.

MY DEAR DR. PUSEY,

Having this day given my answer to an application made to me by Mr. Golightly (with the particulars of which I have been aware that you were made acquainted) I have thought it respectful towards yourself, and right, to send to you a copy of it. The *publication* of Mr. Golightly's letter has called for a more explicit answer than might have been otherwise needful. For, by declining to interfere, it became requisite for me to state plainly and without reserve the considerations which weighed with me. The application indeed made it appear to me a duty to do what I had deliberately foreborne to do before, viz. to look much into your recent publications. The reason of my previous forbearance was, that I apprehended from the little which I did read, that I might be driven to a conviction with which I was most unwilling to be impressed. I should be now wanting in what I owe to yourself if I did not say that the further reading has occasioned me the deepest pain. Much has appeared to me so plainly and directly at variance with several Articles of the Church and with the actual engagements of any one who had pledged himself to the office of a teacher in it, that I cannot without great concern dwell even in thought upon it. My long and habitual personal regard will not allow the entrance into my mind of a suspicion unfavourable to yourself; I cannot however but fear that your authority may tempt others to a conduct which would *in their cases* involve the sacrifice of moral integrity as well as of Christian simplicity. The grace especially needed is *spiritual discernment* to discriminate the path of duty.

I am, my dear Dr. Pusey,

Very sincerely and faithfully yours,

B. P. SYMONS.

Many a man would have lost heart altogether when Bishops and Vice-Chancellors only communicated with him to tell him that he was wanting in some part of elementary morality. But Pusey, conscious of his motives, was prepared to meet a storm of public and private disapproval. The sermon was finished on January 20: and

although Keble had already suggested the subject, Newman's secession and other matters had greatly modified the situation, and Pusey wished to know whether, after reading the sermon, Keble still advised him to preach it.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

131 Marine Parade, Brighton, Jan. 20, 1846.

I have been longing to write to you, but waiting until some pressing things were done. I have been wishing, too, to send you my sermon, which is all but finished, begging you to object to anything you think inexpedient, undesirable. I have wished too, at least in matters which relate to the Church, to be out of my own hands, and under guidance, and that you would tell me what to do. While dear N[ewman] was with us, I meant to take his counsel, although I sometimes mistook it; and it seems now as if the mistakes made were when I had an opinion of my own, e. g. about dear Isaac standing for the Poetry Professorship. Again, I committed myself to Bunsen about the Jerusalem Bishopric, not understanding it, I believe.

I fear now it is too late to ask about the subject of this sermon, although Manning would have wished it otherwise: Richards dreads it. Yet if I were bid, and a subject given me, I could even yet write upon it, although time presses. My grounds for taking it were: (1) that it was the natural subject; that which came next in my series, 'the Power of the Keys.' (2) It seemed, for any doctrinal subject, the most unassailable; for all our formularies are in our favour; there is nothing against it; nothing, I thought, upon which a question could be raised. (3) It is taking away on one side the harsh appearance of the doctrine of repentance, without the remedial system; and now for not quitting it, there comes (4) that people have come to know pretty extensively that I am going to preach upon it (the Heads talked of it last term), so that it might seem as if I were afraid the ground were untenable, and so friends might be dispirited: those who think ill of me might urge it as a proof the more of want of straightforwardness and mistrust in our own cause.

I have shown the statement about the Holy Eucharist in the recapitulation to Manning and Marriott, and they do not think it assailable; but this is a detail on which I should like anyhow to have your judgment. I am now writing on the general subject, (1) whether you would think it anyhow advisable not to preach on the Power of the Keys; (2) if you do, to give me a subject to preach on. I do not see how a word of what I have written can be touched; but it seems obstinate to go on in my own way without asking you as to the general question.

I am obliged to break off in haste to save the post. How is Mrs. Keble? Troubles are very thick on us.

Ever your affectionate and grateful

E. B. P.

Keble's decision was characteristic. Pusey should preach, as he intended, on 'the Absolution of the Penitent.' But he should, if he could, prepare another sermon, to be used if at the moment, for whatever reason, it should seem inadvisable to carry out the original design. The sermon was printed before delivery: the slips were sent to Keble 'to except against every word which you doubt of.' After this second perusal, Keble repeated his previous opinion.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

January 28, 1846.

. . . . Some think that if you had by you one of your plain practical sermons, in the same tone e.g. with the last which you preached at Brighton and published, it would be a golden opportunity of doing good to some of the scores who will be present out of curiosity or a worse motive, to substitute that sermon for the present one; that no one would dream of there being anything like recantation in so doing, or if there were a chance of their doing so, that you might easily obviate it by an introductory sentence or two; and that, in this way, some men might be surprised or shamed into good feeling, who would simply set up their backs against the sermon at present; and so it would come by-and-by with a better chance. I tell you this, not knowing how far it is right, but feeling that it quite depends on the question whether you have such a sermon by you or no, for I am sure it is quite too late to write one. If you have, it seems to me that you cannot be wrong in either taking that or this as your own judgment and feelings may incline; only I would show it to Marriott or some such person, who may be able to help you in detecting everything which the critics might lay hold of. If you have no such sermon by you, it seems a plain and an *intended* course that you should go on with this. I shall be *very* sorry if I give you trouble or perplexity by this.

This was followed up by a long letter containing proposals for twenty-six alterations in the printed text of the sermon. These were mostly verbal; and with scarcely an exception they were adopted by the preacher. He also received comments on the sermon from Archdeacon Manning and Isaac Williams, which were carefully weighed.

At last the 1st of February arrived. The scene in the Cathedral was a far more remarkable one than that which had been witnessed on the occasion of the condemned sermon in 1843. Pusey's own position was, and was felt to be, in many respects different. In 1843

Newman was still at his side ; he had not yet resigned St. Mary's. Now, in Oxford at least, Pusey stood almost alone : Marriott and Copeland, with their many and varied excellences, could not occupy the vacant place. In 1843 the charge of Romanizing was in the air, but as yet nothing had occurred to give it point and emphasis. Now, as the Puritan controversialists were never weary of telling the world, not a few of the most accomplished Tractarians and Newman himself had practically admitted its justice—at least in their own case—by their secession to the Roman Catholic Church. In 1843, although Pusey had been the object of frequent attacks, his learning and his character had forbidden as yet any more violent expression of party animosity ; whereas now he stood before the University as a condemned man—condemned, it is true, without having had a hearing, and by a process which deprived the condemnation of moral weight—but still, before the University and the world condemned, and emerging for the first time from the silence which the sentence of condemnation had imposed on him. It was impossible that an extraordinary interest should not attach to his reappearance in the University pulpit ; and the sermon was anticipated and listened to with greater eagerness—it is probably not too much to say—than any other University sermon in the present century.

The arrangement of Christ Church Cathedral in 1846 was very unlike that of the present day. A solid organ-screen, dating from the Restoration, and pierced by some glazed apertures, cut off the real choir of the church from the transepts and truncated nave, and left a much smaller area within which it was possible to hear a sermon. Nevertheless the choir thus shut off from the pulpit was crowded from end to end : the organ-loft looked as though it might give way, such was the mass of Undergraduates who had got into it ; even the triforium had been invaded by eager listeners. Every inch on the floor of the church was occupied. ' Dr. Pusey,' writes an eye-witness, ' had to move slowly through the dense mass on his way to the corner

of the Cathedral where the Vice-Chancellor and Doctors assemble, visible to nobody but those immediately along the line he had to pass ; his perfectly pallid, furrowed, mortified face looking almost like jagged marble, immovably serene withal, and with eyes fixed in deep humility on the ground, formed a curious contrast with the thick expectant crowd, which the beadles moved aside for him¹. The procession of Heads was obliged to pass straight from the transept to their seats, instead of following their accustomed course, down the south aisle, and then up the nave. When he reached the pulpit, Pusey as usual knelt in prayer, disappearing from sight until the conclusion of the hymn. The sermon lasted for a little more than an hour and a half ; and was listened to with perfect stillness until the Blessing was pronounced. His voice showed no signs of nervousness : from first to last it was perfectly clear, even, and strong.

Pusey's power in the pulpit was in no sense that of a popular preacher. He owed nothing to those arts and accomplishments which have been carried to their greatest perfection in the Church of Massillon and Bourdaloue, and which have never been altogether neglected in any part of Christendom. He had no pliancy of voice ; no command over accent, or time, or tone ; he did not relieve or assist the attention of his audience by a change of pace, from fast to slow, or by pausing between his paragraphs, or by looking off his pages ; his eye was throughout fixed on the manuscript before him, and his utterance was 'one strong, unbroken, intense, monotonous swing, which went on with something like the vibrations of a deep bell.' Nor did Pusey's method or matter supply the defects—if defects they were—of his manner as a preacher. Masses of learning—much of it derived from sources of which the majority even of an University audience had never heard—were only relieved by long, reiterated exhortations, to which fancy, or invective, or anecdote rarely contributed any such element as could modify the reign

¹ *Guardian*, Feb. 4, 1846. Letter by J. B. Mozley.

of a stern monotony. Yet men, old and young, listened to him for an hour and a half in breathless attention: because his moral power was such as to enable him to dispense with the lower elements of oratorical attraction; or it would have rendered their presence an intrusion on higher and holier ground. As J. B. Mozley said, 'Pusey seemed to inhabit his sentences.' Each sentence was instinct with his whole intense purpose of love, as he struggled to bring others into communion with the truth and Person of Him Who purified his own soul; and this attribute of profound reality which characterized his discourse from first to last, as it fell on the superficial and somewhat cynical thought of ordinary academical society, at once fascinated and awed the minds of men, and—whether they yielded their convictions to the preacher or not—at least exacted from them the homage of a sustained and hushed attention.

The sermon was preached on St. John xx. 21–23, and especially on those words of our Lord to His Apostles, 'Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.' It opened with a reference to the preacher's recent suspension, as due to his own 'secret sins.' Then he glanced at the course of teaching which the suspension had interrupted. He had been engaged in exhibiting to the penitent Christian the means of his restoration, and the earnestness of his pardon. Of these means he had spoken first of the Holy Eucharist, as less likely to provoke controversy than Absolution, although coming later in the order and experience of the Christian life; and he now summarized his condemned sermon in a few well-chosen words, which reasserted to the very full its doctrinal position¹. He then passed to the subject before him. All forgiveness of sin is from God. The Church or her ministers are not instead of, but the instruments of Christ, the One Absolver. That He, the One Absolver, did delegate to His Church the absolving power, was plain from the words spoken in the upper chamber; and that the Church of England recognizes

¹ 'Entire Absolution of the Penitent,' p. 3.

this His gracious and awful gift, is clear not only from the less explicit absolutions pronounced over congregations where general sin only may be presumed, in the Daily Service and the Holy Communion, but also and especially in the absolution of the sick after private confession. 'By His authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins,' are the words which she puts into the mouth of her priests in the chamber of death; and when those words are read in connexion with the sentence in which an Anglican Bishop addresses the man whom he is ordaining as a priest, 'Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven,' there can be no doubt that the Church of England teaches the reality of priestly absolution as explicitly as it has ever been taught, or is taught to-day in any part of the Catholic Church.

A large part of the sermon is devoted to practical and spiritual aspects of the subject. Thus, looking to the absence of public and private discipline in the Church of England during past years, he sees a bright side even to that conspicuous neglect of the will of our Lord, which is involved in the neglect of Holy Communion. It is better not to communicate than to communicate carelessly and profanely.

'My whole object, brethren, in all this which I would say, is the comfort of penitents, according to the provisions which our Church has made for them. Elsewhere¹ I have sought, from the practice of primitive antiquity, to vindicate the practical state of our Church, in which Confession is dispensed with as matter of necessity, and left to the consciences of individuals. Yet certainly they who leaving private confession discretionary, put their hand to the work of restoring public discipline, thought not that things would be amongst us as they now are; for Ridley spake of public discipline as "one of the marks whereby the true Church is known in this dark world²," and Latimer (with others) saith, "To speak of right and true Confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing³." Yet God Who in His wisdom suffered their designs to come to nought⁴, has

¹ Note M on Tertullian, pp. 379 sqq. (Library of the Fathers).

² 'Certain Conferences between Dr. N. Ridley and Mr. H. Latimer,' quoted in Wordsworth, App. p. 135.

³ Sermon on the Third Sunday after

Epiphany, quoted by Wordsworth, App. p. 69, and Ridley, ib. p. 71.

⁴ See the account of the several attempts to restore public discipline frustrated, Wordsworth, App. p. 41, sqq.

thereby the more cast upon the Church herself, and, we may trust, would make her discipline the purer, in that He has deprived her of all outward aid in restoring it. And we may even be thankful that the rules which remain¹, requiring all her members to partake of her ordinances, have passed into disuse. For this is most certain, that to encourage indiscriminately the approach to the Holy Communion, without a corresponding inward system whereby they, who are entitled so to do, should know intimately the hearts of those whom they so encourage, has brought with it an amount of carelessness and profanation, which, if known, would make many a heart of those who have done so, sink and quake.

‘It is, then, we may trust, of God’s manifest mercy to this portion of His Church, that He has, at the same time, by His Providence allowed almost all remains of that outward compulsory system to be broken down; and by His Spirit within has aroused, and is arousing, people’s consciences more and more, to desire the full provisions which He has laid up in her for wounded souls. For so shall the whole be the more seen to be His work, and discipline be not the constraint of the disobedient, but, as oftentimes in the oldest times², the longed-for refuge of earnest minds, the binding-up of the broken-hearted, the austere yet loved chastisement of the flesh, “that the soul may be saved in the Day of the Lord.” We can bear no sudden restoration. But in this and all things we need but patiently to wait for His Hand, Who is so graciously and wonderfully restoring us. That type of fatherly rule must be the characteristic of our Church: “volentes per populos dat jura.” “The people shall be willing in the day of Thy power.”’

He had felt he had no choice as to whether he would preach on the subject. The reason was imperative and overwhelming.

‘There is no choice. Consciences are daily awakened by God’s Spirit; some to the knowledge of a frightful past; others, it may be, are unduly burthened. Satan, in the absence of skilful advisers, who might guard the soul against evil, at first subtle, but very desolating, has spread his snares with a dreadful wisdom. Luxury, and the sins of a self-indulgent people, the corruption transmitted from one brief generation of youth to another, or self-originated through the early deceits of Satan, have spread among us a widely-wasting mass of evil, unknown mostly, unwarned against, and therefore the more destructive. Too many know how sin, commenced with scarce the knowledge that it was sin, has, for years of life, cankered every purpose of good; perhaps prepared for deeper, more overt, deadly sin!’

¹ See eighth Rubric, at the end of the Communion Service, and Can. 22.

² See notices of voluntary confession with a view to public penitence,

in note M on Tertullian; S. Aug. de quaestt. 83, q. 26; Serm. 232, § 8; 351 de Poenit. § 7; and Hooker, vi. 4. 6.

He has a word of comfort for those who, from whatever reason, have no opportunity of making confession and receiving absolution.

‘It is certain by the consent of the Universal Church, that whoso is truly contrite of any the most deadly sin—all, which the Ancient Church subjected to years of penitence, and then by imposition of hands formally restored, yea, if he had on him the sins of the whole world, and longeth for Absolution, is absolved. And if the comfort is for a time withheld, while as yet he knows not to whom to turn, who knows what deeper penitence God may not amid this suspense be working in his soul? God’s delays are man’s benefits. “Ask, and ye shall receive.”’

In a Christian University—such as Oxford by its statutes and legal character then was—there ought, he pleads, to be no such difficulty. The College tutors were, with hardly an exception, ordained priests of the Church.

‘It is one of the especial blessings of this place that each is assigned to the care of one who, by his sacred office, is bound to care for his soul. Blessed as that relation has been to many of us, more blessed far might it be to the young, would they recollect that they, with whom they are brought into this relation, are not mere guardians of discipline, but ministers of God. And if the soul of any be burthened, they are, by the very name of their office¹, protectors, guardians, and in the place of parents. We need no new relations, but to bring into fuller life what God has given us².’

Even after this lapse of years the sermon cannot be read without renewing something of that moral and spiritual glow which illuminated the souls of the majority of the great congregation which listened to it. The concluding paragraphs are a magnificent exhortation to those who have sinned deeply and have been pardoned, to devote their lives to some self-denying form of Christian work.

But apart from its theological and spiritual interest, this sermon was really a moral victory for Pusey. In the statement of his whole theological position, he threw down a challenge to his opponents, and they did not dare to take it up. Some time before preaching the sermon he had seen Dr. Jelf, and told him that he meant to reaffirm the doctrine of his last sermon. ‘Take care,’ said Dr. Jelf, ‘how

¹ Tutores.

² ‘Entire Absolution of the Penitent,’ pp. 47-59.

you do it : because if they suspend you a second time it will be in perpetuity.' Pusey replied that he had only used the language of St. Ambrose and other Fathers. 'They care nothing about the Fathers,' rejoined Dr. Jelf, 'you had better use the language of English divines.' This advice was acted on : Pusey restated the doctrine of the condemned sermon exactly, partly in the words of the Communion Service, and partly in those of Bishop Wilson's '*Sacra Privata*.'

The reality of Priestly Absolution was probably even less welcome to the Puritan and Latitudinarian members of the University than the re-statement of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence. But in teaching the truth and efficacy of the Absolving Power, Pusey was also legally as well as theologically on unassailably strong ground, and he knew it.

'He had,' says J. B. Mozley, 'such a huge weight of Church authority with him that he seemed to occupy the whole ground and possess the building for himself. He seemed to turn the vast tide of clamour which has been trying to disconnect us from the Church so long upon the other side'¹.

Pusey's opponents understood the situation. Some of them would gladly have acted on the Vice-Chancellor's hint that Pusey should be delated. But what was there to delate? The priestly commission to absolve given in the Ordinal, and the authoritative interpretation of that commission in the words which the Visitation Service puts into the mouth of individual priests, 'By His authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins,' are integral parts of the Prayer-book. Read in the plain sense of the English language they covered everything Pusey had advanced. His opponents and the Puritan party generally had not yet ventured—as they did afterwards, and have since—on the non-natural interpretation of these passages : an interpretation so violent as to surpass altogether that which they had themselves endeavoured to fasten upon Newman. They knew too well that an

¹ 'Letters of J. B. Mozley,' p. 176.

attack on Pusey in respect to the whole sermon would not bear argument, at any rate before a University public, however generally prejudiced in their favour. Their discretion was pardonably in excess of their valour : and Pusey's sermon was left alone. But he had prepared for the worst. He was determined this time that, if he were condemned, he would be heard before his condemnation. In order to secure this he sent his sermon by post, out of Oxford, immediately after preaching it. Had the Vice-Chancellor asked him for the sermon, he could have appealed to the statute which provides that if a delated sermon is not forthcoming, the preacher shall be examined in person respecting the point on which he has been delated¹.

That this precaution was not altogether uncalled for became apparent from a leading article in *The Times* of Tuesday, Feb. 3. That article would appear to have been written by some one who had heard the sermon ; and it accurately reflects the scared and fanatical irritation of Pusey's opponents, who, as J. B. Mozley had observed four months previously, 'talked and acted as if Pusey were a lion, or some beast of prey².' The writer said everything that he could to provoke a delation of the sermon. After sneering at the supposed insincerity of Pusey's reference to 'secret sins' of his own which God had punished by suspension, he proceeded to point out, and with justice, that the sermon on the Absolution of the Penitent was the 'fit and natural conclusion' of the sermon which had been condemned.

'It betrays,' he continues, 'the same leaning to doctrines repudiated by the Church of England ; it exhibits the same clouds and darkness, and deals in the like subtle and abstruse enigmas. Lowly as the style may look, there is no mistaking the animus which flows (sic) beneath it ; priestly self-satisfaction and sufficiency creep to the very surface ; an unconquered will pervades it. The text of the sermon already announces the assumption of the old position, and proclaims the tenacity with which the holy warrior is prepared to fight for sacerdotal rights.'

¹ De Concionibus, xii. 11 : 'Si prætendat se exemplar non habere, de iis de quibus suspectus vel delatus fuit, directe respondebit.'

² 'Letters of J. B. Mozley,' p. 172.

The writer was too shrewd to refer to the formularies of the Church of England ; and he is evidently not less angry with the text—as indeed he had every reason for being—than with the sermon. On this occasion the leading journal thundered in vain. The cooler heads at Oxford knew what was and what was not capable of being represented with any chance of success as ‘a doctrine repudiated by the Church of England.’ A second secret tribunal would have been impossible ; and Pusey’s opponents could only regret that the Reformers had done their work incompletely and that the Prayer-book contained ‘relics of Popery’ behind which Pusey could only too easily take shelter.

The days passed, and no summons from the Vice-Chancellor arrived. ‘Pusey,’ wrote J. B. Mozley, ‘is in high spirits,—good spirits rather: and I think a little feeling of satisfaction at having silenced his silencers so effectually might a little mingle with his feelings¹.’ The usual formula in regions inhabited by the Heads of Houses was that the sermon was ‘much to be lamented but not to be complained of¹.’ ‘Mr. Mildmay of Merton,’ writes Lady Lucy Pusey to Lady Emily two days after the sermon, ‘tells me that the Warden, whose opinions were very different from Edward’s, had said “they were not going to do anything, and that they wanted peace².”’ ‘The Heads say “We want peace,”’ wrote Pusey to Rev. T. E. Morris ; ‘I wish it had been found out sooner.’ He wrote to Keble of the general result as ‘a great and undeserved mercy, which he trusted had helped to quiet minds’ that were in doubt about the claims of the English Church.

The publication of the sermon in London followed within a few weeks upon its delivery. Pusey added some pages of preface, in which he discusses, from the point of view of religious common-sense rather than that of Church authority, the objections which were urged against the sermon. With characteristic gentleness he deals with that widespread feeling or temper, so difficult to analyze, which set itself against the special doctrine and practices which

¹ ‘Letters of J. B. Mozley,’ p. 176.

² *Ibid.*

he was advocating. The sermon was sent by Pusey to many friends, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Mr. Harrison acknowledged it: but objected to Pusey's reference in his preface to Roman Catholic books of direction for confessors¹. Pusey replied:

E. B. P. TO REV. B. HARRISON.

Christ Church, March 2, 1846.

With regard to my quoting R. C. manuals. People object to all confession as applied to the young, because their minds, they say, are poisoned. I know how the young suffer from want of confession. Every case of penitence I know of (and it is borne out by others) began in early sin for which confession would have been the remedy. I must know of some 1000, I believe I may say thousands (for one hears indirectly of so much more without hearing names) of deadly early sin, which confession might, by God's blessing, have saved. I believe this prejudice sown against confession is purely the work of the devil. Yet it is being done diligently. People are not ashamed to read and circulate the work of an infidel. I felt it then a duty to protest strongly against all this. And in proof of it, what words could I refer to but the R. C.s themselves? It is the only evidence. Bailly too has just been infamously misrepresented in a tract circulated by a R. C. convert (?). Such converts make one think of the Jewish saying, 'Proselytes are the leprosy of the Church.'

I purposely had the two sermons done up together. The first sentence of my sermon meant (as *The Times* perfectly understood it) to acknowledge that I deserved the chastisement of God, not the censure of man. I meant to reaffirm the doctrine of the sermon, while I owned that I myself for 'secret faults,' not for the doctrine, was so chastened. Others may, if they please, acknowledge the authority of the Six; I protested against it; I believe my sermon to contain God's truth, and that is dearer to me than man's authority. One must protest against heresy even in the Abp. of Dublin, or against authority put forth against the truth in the Six. . . .

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

Archdeacon Churton had been unwilling to take part in the consecration services at St. Saviour's, but he hailed the appearance of Pusey's sermon with genuine satisfaction. He had his criticisms to make on portions of it. As to the general worth of the sermon, the Archdeacon expressed himself as follows:—

¹ See 'Entire Absolution of the Penitent,' Pref. p. xii.

Feb. 26, 1846.

I did not wish to write to thank you for your sermon before I had read it. Having now found time to do so in the midst of many occupations, it is due to your kindness in sending it to me, and to the good earnest doctrine of the sermon itself, to thank you for it very heartily.

As none of the Oxford Doctors appear to have found fault with it, one is relieved from all fear as to the doctrine, and there was no occasion for me to read it, as I did your sermon on the Holy Eucharist, wondering when and where the condemned proposition would appear. I hope it is not too much to say that which I really feel most inclined to say on this happy result: I do not so much congratulate you on an event which has virtually effaced the former discouragement, as I am grateful to a good Providence which has protected you in delivering your own soul of truths so important, and so deeply affecting our hopes of better days and reviving discipline to the afflicted Church—so calculated at once to put the individual conscience of hearers and readers on an earnest self-examination, and to awaken the hearts of the young candidates for the Church's ministry in Oxford and elsewhere to a sense of the responsibilities, the difficulties and dangers, as good Bp. Bull would have said, of the Priest's sacred office. I trust I am truly grateful for this restoration of our hopes; and let me humbly and heartily believe, that God, Who has given you such a portion of faith and patience, has still good work for you to do in the midst of all our pressing and perilous controversies. . . .

Ever very sincerely yours,

EDW. CHURTON.

CHAPTER III.

THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC—BISHOP GOBAT'S APPOINTMENT—SCHEMES FOR EXTENSION OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION—ILLNESS AT TENBY.

1846.

IT was indeed a moment of relief to Pusey when he found that the truths which he had so boldly stated in his sermon were not to be immediately and directly assailed. But it was a relief in only one direction. The tide of secessions continued ; the attitude of the authorities was generally hostile ; many hearts were in consequence failing in love and loyalty to the English Church. And, amidst it all, the unhappy complication about the Jerusalem Bishopric was revived, and that in an intenser form.

It will be remembered that when in 1841 it was proposed that a Bishopric at Jerusalem should be established, Pusey had at first tried to make the best of the experiment. Therein he differed widely from Newman, who has described the scheme as the blow which finally shattered his faith in the Anglican Church¹. Fuller reflection and a rude experience of its effects on the minds of others, and pre-eminently on Newman, had led Pusey to pray earnestly that it might be abandoned at the first opportunity.

After holding the office between four and five years, Dr. Alexander, the first Bishop, died suddenly on Nov. 23, 1845. According to the terms of the agreement between the British and Prussian Governments, the nomination to the vacant post now rested with the latter. On March 7, 1846,

¹ 'History of my Religious Opinions,' p. 143 (ed. 1865).

Baron Bunsen wrote to the Rev. S. Gobat, offering him the succession to Dr. Alexander, and assuring him that the King of Prussia's presentation had the 'unconditional approbation' of the British Government, and would receive the 'canonical sanction' of the Archbishop of Canterbury¹. The offer was accepted.

Mr. Gobat had been employed in Abyssinia by the Church Missionary Society while a Lutheran pastor², and had published a Journal of his work which shewed how little alive he was to such doctrinal questions as would certainly confront him at Jerusalem. At this moment, however, he was in Deacon's orders in the Church of England, having been ordained by Bishop Blomfield in August, 1845.

Pusey felt it a matter of duty not to acquiesce in Mr. Gobat's appointment. He hoped not only to prevent it, but to get rid of the Bishopric altogether. With this view he appealed to Mr. Gladstone, asking him to write a letter to Dr. Mill, who was Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was anxious to shew the Archbishop any evidences he could of the feeling of sound Churchmen on the subject.

E. B. P. TO THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Clifton, Thursday in Holy Week [April 9], 1846.

What a misery it would be if the ultimate object of the Prussian Government were attained, and they were to receive Episcopacy from us, and we were to become the authors of an heretical Succession. I should think it would split the English Church at once; it would put one, if one lived to see it, in a most distressing position. To be alive to heresy is a mark of full soundness of faith. To give Episcopacy to Prussia now, or even to prepare for it, is like arraying a corpse, or whitening a sepulchre. Surely, while they are struggling for the very elements of the faith, recovering what they can, indifferent about some doctrines, hostile to others, it would be very miserable to mix ourselves up with them or commit to them so sacred a deposit.

Then, for our relations with the Eastern Churches, I suppose the persons who would be likely to be chosen would be the very unfittest. From our long unacquaintance with Eastern heresies and the very

¹ 'The Jerusalem Bishopric: Documents, &c.,' by Prof. Heckler. London, Trübner, 1883, pp. 130-132.

² 'Memoir of Bishop Gobat.' London, Nisbet, 1884, pp. 56, 57.

nature of them, and our want of teaching in the *θεολογία*, and the very popular character of our own practical system, it is to be feared that most among us would be very little able to engage in intercourse with the Eastern heresies, especially the Monophysite. . . .

Yours most faithfully and obliged,

E. B. PUSEY.

Mr. Gladstone had, like Pusey, originally approved of the plan, and had also for some time ceased to support it. He replied to Pusey that he agreed in thinking that the continuance of the Bishopric at Jerusalem boded little good and more evil to the English Church, while it tended in no degree towards improving Lutheranism. Still, while recommending immediate resistance to the appointment of Bunsen's nominee, he deprecated any attempt at present to get rid of the Bishopric, and suggested that it had better be left either to die a natural death or to be altered so as to render it 'safe instead of slippery.'

Pusey could not bring himself to take Mr. Gladstone's advice. He was not prepared to acquiesce in the consecration of a second Bishop, and to limit his efforts to the object of securing a proper appointment. On the day of his receiving Mr. Gladstone's letter he wrote the subjoined letter to the Rev. B. Harrison, requesting him to place it before the Archbishop of Canterbury.

E. B. P. TO REV. B. HARRISON.

Clifton, Easter Monday [April 13], 1846.

MY DEAR HARRISON,

I have an anxious subject to write upon, on which I know you must think differently from me, but on which I wish only to state facts, the Jerusalem Bishopric. I seem to have the fate of Cassandra; yet I must do what in me lies, and leave things to God. These things make me fainthearted sometimes, so as to create a sort of doubt, 'Are these persons whom I am anxious to see retained in our Communion, after all, to go? is it God's will? and am I perhaps striving ignorantly against His will in trying to detain them? I see what is likely to shake them and say so, and still it is done; and they are shaken and at last they go. Am I not simply wasting time in trying to do anything?' You, I believe, thought so long ago. Yet what can one do if one sees people who love our Church, and wish to serve her, shaken? One cannot without a pang see those go who wish to serve God in her. I know not how much you know of the feelings or mind of those

who have left us, or whom we are in danger of losing. They have not mostly been what are called Romanizers, i. e. they have not been drawn to Rome, but frightened from ourselves. Dear N. said to me (it must be some few three or four years past, I think), 'I feel less against Rome, now I see less chance of escaping it,' or to this effect; i. e. (as I interpreted it), the more he feared about the English Church, the more he was obliged to submit his mind to the doctrines of the Roman, which was his only alternative. It was a long struggle. He clung to our Church. The doctrine as to St. Mary was a difficulty to him for years. I believe (and so does another friend who saw him even closer than I), that the Jerusalem Bishopric was that which struck the blow from which he never recovered. He said, that nothing which was said by any of those who wrote upon it came near the depth of the ground on which he deprecated it. That same feeling still exists in others. I feel all this the more deeply, because I was misled by Bunsen myself in the first instance; and now when people speak of it, and how others are shaken by it, it is like 'a sword in my bones.' One whom we both love said to me a short time past, himself pale and agitated, 'If the Bishops did but know the feeling there is about the Jerusalem Bishopric, their hands would tremble while they consecrated another Bishop.' He is one who knows the minds of many who are distressed, more than even myself. He said to me, what I said just now, 'They who will leave us will not be Romanizers, but persons pressed by the doctrine of unity, and distressed by things among ourselves.' 'They are not in the least prepared for Roman doctrine in itself; they will receive it, because they cannot do otherwise, on authority.'

Such is a state of things which I cannot but wish respectfully made known to the Archbishop; you know my own grateful feelings to him, and so does he himself; he cannot think I could write or mean anything but what is entirely respectful; and so, while this letter is confidential from any one else, I should be glad if it could be made known to the Archbishop.

Things have seemingly much changed since the first appointment was made; we have seen more of the Prussian temper and what they mean by it, and that the statements of Bunsen and Abeken are no index whatever of the mind of their countrymen. It does not seem to be a straightforward proceeding on the part of the K[ing] of Pr[ussia] towards the English Church. It is not a people asking at the hands of the English Church what we have and they have not; they plainly look on this as a concession on our part, not on theirs; as if we were coming down to their level, not they rising to ours. It is a recognition of Evangelicalism on our part, not of the necessity, or even expediency, of Episcopacy on theirs. We commit ourselves to Lutheranism; the King of Prussia alone commits himself to Episcopacy. The Jerusalem Bishopric is a sort of experiment on the part of the King of Prussia, how far his subjects can be familiarized to Episcopacy, as a better sort of government than their own, without

any idea of any spiritual gift through it. But were this to succeed, things would be far worse. A jealous heedfulness against intermingling with heretics has, you know, always been a mark of the Church. To be the parent of an heretical Succession would be very miserable¹. Yet I suppose there would scarcely be an individual among the German Protestants who holds the true doctrine of the Sacraments, or the Nicene Creed as it was held by the Fathers at Nicaea. And this is one thing which people feel so keenly. Whereas the English Church has, since the separation, always been rising upwards towards the early Church, this is mingling her with those whom the early Church would have counted heretical.

The other parties with whom the Jerusalem Bishopric connects us seem to me no less dangerous. It would require almost Apostolic wisdom not to commit us very dangerously in such varied relations. The expectations of those who in this country most speak of the Jews, seem more likely to terminate in Anti-Christ than in Christ. Certainly, as far as there is ground to believe, with many of the Fathers, that Anti-Christ will arise out of the Jews, the present expectations of the Jews, encouraged by these their friends, directly tend that way². Then for our intercourse with the E[ast]. You are, I believe, much interested in this. Yet what immeasurable evil one step in a wrong direction might do! You well know how little of theologians (strictly so called) our clergy mostly are, and least of all the persons likely to be thought of on account of other parts of their office. Their theology is professedly so popular, that what was part of the faith to the Ancient Church is to them mere speculation. Thus M. Gobat (who I see is spoken of) writes in his Abyssinian Journal as though the Monophysites were only in the wrong, because they thought at all upon the subject of their heresy, and that the Church was equally wrong on its side (such at least is my memory of the book). Now besides the actual mischief of such an one being a Bishop at all, consecrated through our Church, what almost certainty there is that

¹ That there was at times a very real danger of amalgamation with the Prussian State Church, from which the English Church was providentially delivered, appears from the 'Memoir of Bishop Gobat,' London, Nisbet, 1844, pp. 305, 314, 315.

² On the Judaizing character of much of the teaching in the Anglo-Prussian body at Jerusalem, see 'Sermons preached at Jerusalem in 1842 and 1843,' by Rev. G. Williams, M.A., Preface. Mr. Williams alludes to the substitution 'of the exploded literal, for the received spiritual, interpretation of the prophecies relating to the privileges and glories of the Israel of God,' and to 'views which

sometimes go the length of looking to the restoration of the bloody sacrifices of the law, and the re-establishment of the Levitical ritual.' Compare the satisfaction which was felt that after 'more than 1700 years,' an Israelite by birth had been made Bishop in Jerusalem ('The Jerusalem Bishopric Documents, &c.,' London, Trübner, 1883, p. 25), and the petition addressed to Bishop Alexander by 'Charlotte Elizabeth.' (Cf. 'Israel's Ordinances examined; a Reply to Charlotte Elizabeth's Letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem,' by Moses Margoliouth, of Trinity College, Dublin. London, Wertheim, 1844.)

he would commit us in some way with the Monophysites. You recollect probably how, a few years ago, some of the United States Bishops did receive a Nestorian Bishop into Communion (and would have gone further, had he not, by God's Providence, shown his character further), and what scandal it produced. And what a shock this again would be in our Church.

I did hope that the sudden death of Bishop Alexander might be of God's Providence, to put an end to the Jerusalem Bishopric. There seems to have been a blight upon it. It yielded no fruit. The changed position of the Germans and the dislike to it on the part of many in the English Church seemed a ground why the Archbishop might withdraw, and not use his personal power of giving the Succession, or consecrating a Bishop, without the advice of the whole English Church.

However, I am merely to state facts. We shall have losses still. But the minds of some are tranquillized. Yet everything depends upon our having peace. When people's minds are in such a state as they now are, every breath does harm. If nothing new happens, I hope they may become more firmly rooted. But the loss of dear Newman has been an intense shock. You would be frightened if you knew how deep and wide the shock has been, or who, or what sort of people, know not what will become of them hereafter, although they see no definite time of going. Yet, as I said, I do hope they might get rooted, if nothing new happens. But it is of the intensest importance that things should be still. In a drought any breath will carry off leaves which, if space were given, might again be green and render their office in the tree which bears them.

I cannot say what an exceeding blessing a suspension of the Jerusalem Bishopric would be. I hope to pray earnestly for it. It would make one breathe again.

I am sure that if the Archbishop were to read M. Gobat's Abyssinian Journal he could not consecrate him; so people say, who would make a public protest against it, if done. But this is only a part of the evil. I feel as [if] I could bless God more fervently for the suspension of the Jerusalem Bishopric than for the life of a dying child: by how much the Church must be dearer to one than one's own life or one's child.

You will present my best respects to His Grace.

All Easter blessing be with you.

Ever yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

Pusey's correspondent was not sympathetic. He thought that love of the Church of Rome had had more to do with Newman's secession than repulsion for the Church of England. If the Prussians did not wish for Episcopacy,

the King of Prussia did, and that was the matter of main concern. To give up the Bishopric, when an English Bishop had died, in order to prevent the appointment of a Prussian, would be held to be bad faith by the Prussian Government. Mr Harrison could not think that the Jews would be worse for having a Bishop; and the grace of Consecration, together with the influence of Lambeth, might be trusted to enable such a Bishop to deal wisely and faithfully with Eastern heretics. If the Jerusalem Bishopric had not achieved much, there was the less reason for interfering with it. With regard to Mr. Gobat's theological opinions, as expressed in his published 'Journal of a Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia,' Mr. Harrison attempted to gloss over the real character of his statements, without any clear appreciation of the questions involved in them. As a matter of fact Mr. Gobat had used language which suggested that he treated the doctrine of the Church on the subject of our Lord's two Natures as a matter of indifference.

Pusey was deeply grieved at the contents and the tone of this letter. In spite of hopeful anticipations at the time of his appointment, he had said 'We shall lose Harrison if he goes to Lambeth'; and he feared that his words were now being fulfilled, and that his pupil was not unaffected by that temptation to make compromises of principle, which no doubt sometimes besets those who are concerned in the delicate complexities of Church administration.

E. B. P. TO REV. B. HARRISON.

Third Sunday after Easter [May 3], 1846.

I conclude you did not expect an answer to your letter; you mistook mine in some things, but it is not of any moment to remove the impression, whatever it was. We seem like persons, communicating facts or impressions to the other, as a sort of duty; neither expecting, or hardly, to produce any effect on the other's mind; and each probably pained by what the other says: I should be exceedingly, if I thought you could really apologize for Mr. Gobat's language. Looking upon you as a representative of a class, as every one is, more or less, it would go far to make me despond as to our yet seeing even the dawn of any better day for the English Church.

Proposed Protest against Mr. Gobat's Ordination. 77

Marriott, W. H. Mill, Church, J. B. Mozley, Scott of Hoxton, and others joined Pusey in his efforts. But their efforts and representations were apparently powerless. It was announced that Mr. Gobat was to be ordained Priest by the Bishop of London in St. Paul's Cathedral on Trinity Sunday. This gave the opportunity of raising a formal protest at the time of the ordination against Mr. Gobat's published opinions. But Pusey was obviously not the person to make that objection.

E. B. P. to REV. J. KEBLE.

Whit Tuesday, June 2 [1846].

It is not for such as I to suggest anything to you. However Dodsw[orth] has been told that M. Gobat is to be a candidate for Ordination *as Priest* next Sunday by the Bishop of London at St. Paul's.

It would be very miserable if he were to be ordained without any protest thus publicly in the face of the English Church. It would be impossible afterwards to do anything. But I know not how people are to sit still, and think that those words of appeal in the Ordination Service are to be said and none to answer. There seems something which one would wish to avoid in the London clergy opposing the act of their own Bishop, i. e. one would rather have it done by others, if it could. But on an emergency D[odsworth] would do it.

He mentioned to me the former objection that it was recognizing the Jerusalem Bishopric, but this would not be so now, since this is an objection to his being admitted to the Order of Priesthood in the English Church until he have publicly recanted heresy publicly put forth.

Could you do it by yourself or in conjunction with others? Dods-worth is writing to Manning and Hook, I to Gresley and Marriott, but without much hope except from Marriott. Hope would prepare any legal information which might be necessary as to the mode of proceeding. I suppose this occasion ought not to be missed.

Will you kindly answer D. as I am returning to Oxford, and it is important for him to know?

Ever your affectionate and grateful

E. B. P.

D. thinks a letter from Judge Coleridge to the Bishop of London or Archbishop of Canterbury would be of use. If you think so, perhaps you would say so to him.

You will have had Dr. Mill's letter speaking about an investigation; but, if this is satisfactory, i. e. if M. Gobat does disavow all heresy, the Church ought to know it. It ought to be made known before he is ordained.

To the Rev. W. Gresley Pusey wrote—after explaining the circumstances :—

‘ Could you either, by yourself, or with others, appear, to allege the impediment ? I should fear it would be very injurious, if one who had so publicly avowed heresy were admitted without any disavowal. It is enough to make the very stones cry out.’

It must not be supposed that the whole English Episcopate was silently acquiescing. Dr. Phillpotts of Exeter, one of the ablest prelates on the Bench, had, on May 25, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury a public protest, in which he notified his dissent from the consecration of another Bishop on seven grounds. He pointed out that the Bishop was not to come under all the obligations of the English Episcopate by signing the Canons, and that the ‘ United German Church was a new and, until these few years, an unheard-of denomination ’; that the Liturgy used by the German Protestants was ‘ grievously defective on more than one momentous particular,’ while it was sanctioned under the terms of the Jerusalem Bishopric Scheme; and that candidates for ordination in Jerusalem, if Germans, were required to sign the Confession of Augsburg as well as the Thirty-nine Articles. Bishop Phillpotts’ objection was to the scheme of the Jerusalem Bishopric : he does not notice Mr. Gobat’s personal disqualifications.

The stir thus made so far prevailed that Mr. Gobat did not present himself in St. Paul’s on Trinity Sunday. The Bishop of London intimated that he could not ordain him to the priesthood until both he and the Archbishop were satisfied on the subject of his orthodoxy. Mr. Gobat thereupon addressed to the Bishop of London an ‘ explanation ’ of the language in his Journal. This amounted to a retraction of its literal and obvious meaning, and was followed by his subscribing the Three Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles, and by a statement that ‘ in particular he fully subscribed the language of the second Article.’ He was ordained Priest at Fulham, and five days later was consecrated Bishop at Lambeth on July 5, 1846.

Pusey, however, was by no means absorbed in ecclesiastical controversy. He was always interested in every proposal to extend University education on economical lines and on Church principles. At this time he was engaged in the first of many efforts which he made in this direction, and which were at last more or less realized by the foundation of Keble College, in which he took so important a part.

In the summer of 1845 a large number of men, most of whom were connected with political life, were strongly impressed with the necessity of strengthening and extending the Universities so as to enable them to do more to meet the wants of the growing population of the country and of the empire, and so discharge their own deeper and wider responsibilities. Sir Robert Peel was greatly interested in the subject of increasing the number of undergraduates at Oxford and of reducing their expenses. Dr. Cotton, the Provost of Worcester, found the Vice-Chancellor and others favourably disposed to entertain the question; and a meeting was held at the house of Lord Sandon (afterwards Earl of Harrowby) to draw up a public statement, which ultimately assumed the form of a memorial to the Hebdomadal Board.

Philip Pusey wrote to his brother :—

‘ July 20, 1845.

‘The principle will be to combine men of all parties: and there ought to be no fear of the matter falling into the hands of the Low Church, as we ought to have Halls added to many Colleges and several new Colleges built. Gladstone will no doubt take an active part in promoting it. I have mentioned you to Sandon as friendly to the plan, but should like to have your direct authority on the subject.’

Pusey at once replied at length to his brother on the subject.

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

Ilfracombe, July 21, 1845.

I have no doubt whatever of the absolute need of increased education at Oxford. To take the Clergy alone; we are crippled everywhere for the want of them; it is useless to build new churches without an enlarged supply of Clergy. What is wanted everywhere and for everything is—not funds, but men. But our present supply is

necessarily limited, and I should think decreasing, rather than increasing, in consequence of the openings and fresh demands for educated men elsewhere.

Still more we need an example of reducing expense. The great besetting evil of a decaying wealthy state is self-indulgence; while good has certainly wonderfully increased on the one side, since our times, yet on the other and with others so has luxury, eating out the energies of many of our young men, and rendering them unfit for anything. On a public occasion, one of the oldest tutors of a chief College in Oxford told the young men that the prevailing vice was 'sordidia,' a listless indifference and in exertion about anything, connected with luxury and self-indulgent habits. Any plan which should set an example of simpler, more self-denying ways, would act most healthfully on the rest of the University. There is a very good spirit abroad, counter-working this apathy and careless self-indulgence, although I fear that of late things have rather gone back: still there is a great deal of good, which might be called out by the example of simpler ways.

And for the Clergy (to speak of what must always be a great body of the University, and on whom so much everywhere depends) inexpensive habits are manifestly more desirable than ever. Of course, self-indulgence, besides the peril of more grievous sin, is opposed to the very first principles of a clergyman's duty; but, I fear, the worse habits and acts have been too common, which self-indulgence naturally leads to, and which, at the best, embitter and cramp subsequent life and duty. One, much about Colleges, said to me that he used to be a Churchman, but that he had seen so much of the lives of those who were soon after ordained as Clergy, that he did not know what to think about anything. I fear he has become a sceptic, on account of the inconsistent lives of our future Clergy.

But then, too, everything shows that we want Clergy who should live upon a little; and so God, in His Providence, is leading us this way. Ill-endowed Cures are what are chiefly multiplied. If our people are to be provided at all with Clergy, it must be with such as are content with little more than food and raiment.

But, more generally, as luxury is the decay of any state, so the antidote must be simplicity in every class.

It would then, over and above the increase of numbers, be of exceeding value to have persons living more simply, in a state of education, and would, I doubt not, act most healthfully upon our existing [Collegiate] bodies. But for this, it would be most desirable that we should have bodies so educated, in which simplicity should be the rule.

I shall be very thankful if, as you say, all can join in it. We ought all surely to have the confidence that whatever is right will, in whatever degree, tend to advance the truth somehow, by God's blessing. Disunion and want of natural love is our great bane. Of course, one must act, one's self, upon one's own principles; but whatever there is of earnestness and devotedness anywhere must be on the side of God

somehow, and working secretly to His ends. With Him then I leave cheerfully the issue of all which is done for Him and His glory, knowing that if things are not done our way, anything which is so done (which is far better) will be overruled in His.

But I shall be very glad if people, otherwise seeing things differently, can unite in any broad, large plan upon the common principles of the University and the Church. It would be one step towards healing our miserable disunion.

God bless you and all you would do for others.

Mr. Pusey replied by sending his brother a copy of the paper drawn up at Lord Sandon's. It pointed out that University education did not keep pace with the extension and multiplication of schools or with the requirements of the Church and the country. It recommended the foundation of 'new departments in existing Colleges, or, if necessary, of new collegiate bodies.' It suggested that 'in such institutions, if the furniture were provided by the College and public meals alone allowed to the exclusion of private entertainments, annual College payments might be reduced to £60 a year, and the total annual expense to £80.' This paper was signed by thirty-two peers, members of Parliament, and leading clergymen. Pusey's enthusiasm was kindled by the encouragement of self-denial and simplicity of life which was involved in the project. He replies as follows :—

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

[Ilfracombe], July 29, 1845.

I am very glad of the paper you sent me. I cannot but hope very much from all these efforts on a large scale, and especially when the object is to foster greater simplicity and self-denial and all the habits connected with them.

I should think you were quite on the safe side in setting the total expenses at £80, but the more there are in a College, the more economical.

If you could get them to consent to open new Halls on this principle, I think you might get Heads who, for the sake of carrying out the principle, would discharge the office gratuitously. I should think you would do best with distinct Colleges or Halls, not one College only, but several.

However, what we most want in all these things, is to pray Him, in Whose Hands they are, to direct them. He does often give us, very

VOL. III.

G

wonderfully, and beyond all our expectation, what we pray for perseveringly.

May He be with you ever.

Charles Marriott, who was always interested in plans for missionary and clerical colleges, was at this time busying himself in endeavouring to interest others in the project for a new college in Oxford.

'The earthquake,' he wrote to Bishop Selwyn with reference to Newman's secession, 'goes off as great earthquakes do, with smaller ones lingering behind. I think, however, that nothing falls but what was before severely shaken. In the meantime, we have some schemes for building again "the rebellious and the bad city," especially one for a new college here, to be conducted on strict and religious principles, and, if possible, to have a will and life of its own. Some are against its being here: but I hope it will be carried. I think nothing will do us so much good.'

It was to this scheme in its early form—which never was realized—that Pusey referred in a communication to Mr. Gladstone, who had taken a leading part in the meeting at Lord Sandon's. Pusey was afraid that the public men who were engaged in trying to extend University education and lessen its cost, were on the one hand proposing more than could be achieved in the way of collegiate extension, and on the other were likely to forget that it is advisable that simple and inexpensive habits should have a religious motive and sanction.

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Ilfracombe [Aug. 23], 1845.

C. M. wrote this at my request, because we felt that a formation of new institutions is absolutely essential to the plan in which you have taken an interest. I am glad of everything which may be tried as an experiment, because everything which tends to increased simplicity, *ipso facto*, tends to good. It is in the right direction. But the mere increase of existing colleges must (1) be inadequate in amount; (2) it may very likely be one-sided. From local circumstances, very few colleges can enlarge themselves, fewer will. You know the locality of Oxford well, and how few can, except at an exceeding outlay, enlarge themselves. Of some who could, e.g. our own, or Magdalen, it is hardly to be hoped except in another century. There might then be a great danger of altering the balance of things, by the infusion of one element only; in one word, I hardly can calculate what the conse-

quences might not be, of enlarging Worcester or Wadham (if so be) alone. But then, besides, it will be more difficult really to carry out the two systems in the same college. It was urged as a difficulty to placing the Missionary College in Oxford, that it would be in an uncongenial atmosphere, on account of the expensive habits of others, &c. I felt that its object would support it. But how much is the difficulty aggravated, if economy is the only avowed object, if there is no higher principle put forth to support it, no countenance from the Heads or Fellows living among them, nor any other aim, except to be educated cheaply, because they cannot afford to be educated expensively; instead of learning to 'bear hardness as good soldiers of Christ.' And all this in the same college. It is to be expected that such will seek such self-indulgence as they can, because they are only to be expected to debar themselves from it, because, by the *res angusta domi*, it is withheld by them.

If the plan is to succeed, it must be made respectable. Voluntary poverty must uphold the involuntary. One or more institutions in which all alike were poor, would keep others in countenance, in which some only were so; it would raise the 'poor students' as a class, when some should be '*pauperes Christi*.' This, however, may be esoteric. Exoterically, it is quite impossible that the plan you and my brother wish for can be carried out, without new institutions. In mere point of numbers it cannot. In its flourishing times, Oxford was full of halls, of which there are the remains now.

Philip mentioned two objections to this: (1) that the friends of the plan would fall asunder on the question of appointments; (2) the great increase of expense.

As to (1), I think it might be met by vesting the appointment of the first Head in some one in whom all moderate people might have confidence, e.g. the Archbishop of Canterbury, leaving the Head to appoint the first Fellows with the sanction of the Archbishop; and if all could not agree even in this, so much of the plan might be carried on by such as do.

For (2), if the system of halls could be revived (which would be far best), there would be scarcely any additional expense, nothing worth naming. And then any of these which were good, might, as I believe of old, become colleges, [by] becoming endowed; others might continue [halls]; bad ones drop through. But for this the consent of the Heads is necessary, and I know not who would have the appointment, whether the Chancellor necessarily.

Yet a college is really no such great additional expense, where people wish to live simply. Junior Studentships at Christ Church are, I think, £30 per annum. £50 would find food and raiment. A Warden then and six Fellows might be founded for £350 per annum, i.e. at 3 per cent. about £12,000. This is an odd way of calculating; however it is, I suppose, mostly, this is inversely as to their worth. This might be enough for a good-sized college.

A college, as you know, can be chartered by the Crown alone.

I am very glad to hear that you and Philip are going on a tour together in Ireland. Should you be at Pusey before for a day or two, I should be glad to get over with C. Marriott to talk over the plan with you and T. A[cland] and Philip. I am sure that we ought to have several colleges or halls, in time, if Oxford is really to be an adequate place of education.

This is only a supplement on externals to C. Marriott's, which are the strong grounds. T. A[cland] is of course welcome to see both, if you think it worth while.

Wishing you all blessing,

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

Mr. Gladstone was delighted with Marriott's plan. Why should not the author of such a plan at once try to realize it? As to Pusey's wish to give a religious character to the College, he suggests that it would be enough to found a frugal College without making any profession that would justify hostile minds in treating it as a novelty or peculiarity.

Marriott could not act on this suggestion until he knew whether he could get two or three such men as he wanted to help him. But the excitement and anxiety of the following October caused a temporary delay in carrying out such efforts as Mr. Gladstone proposed.

However, in the spring of 1846 the Hebdomadal Board replied to the memorial that had been presented to them by the meeting at Lord Sandon's. Of course they agreed in the opinion that the University ought to be extended. They were however mindful that much had been done 'since the peace of 1814' to meet the increased demand for admission. On the proposal to build and endow a new college they observed that it 'was suited rather to ancient munificence than to the economical views of modern times.' Even if it were possible to found a new college on economical principles, it was, they held, 'little likely that a new institution would long continue better or more economical than the old. . . . In a few years the general character and regulations of any new institution would probably be as like the rest as these were like one another.'

The question of additional buildings in existing colleges was a matter for each college to decide upon. The reply was generally discouraging enough, but it contained one very good suggestion. It recommended the foundation of exhibitions to be conferred, not upon grounds of literary merit, but of poverty, character, and economical habits, for the direct purpose of aiding those and only those who needed such assistance.

Mr. Gladstone did not conceal his disappointment at this reply of the Heads of Houses. Pusey's experience of them had prepared him to be grateful for very slight encouragement.

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Clifton, Thursday in Holy Week,
[April 9], 1846.

. . . . I am almost surprised at your being disheartened by the answer of the Committee of Heads. You have been accustomed to their mode of proceeding these many years. I never expected anything but tolerance. They do not see their way to anything new: I hardly expected that they would. I did hope they might have considered the question of 'Additional Collegiate Buildings, belonging though not attached to existing colleges,' a sort of halls. I believe the real hindrance to this was that it required a new statute; and they are weary (at last) of all these contests, and wish to go in stillness (which is so far good). But they do not object to others founding colleges; only they say they have no faith, either that persons in these days will found colleges, or that, if founded, they would be better than those existing. I did not suppose that they would [have such faith]. If they could reduce expense in the existing colleges, they would: and what they cannot do, they do not suppose that others can. But they leave it open for people to try if they can. And this is all I ever wished from them; not to object. Let the trial be made, and we should see whether a Head who lived with and for his young men would not bring that about which they cannot, and in time raise the tone of the whole.

I do not see, then, that there is any ground to be discouraged. C. Marriott still retains his opinion strongly that much, very much, might be done. It is no difficulty that the existing Heads look coldly on the plan. The very object is, by God's blessing, that fresh life should be infused into the body by a new institution. They offer no objection to the trial being made. The only questions then are (1) whether the Crown would charter a college poorly endowed in the first instance, with the moral certainty that it would receive enlarged endowments hereafter. (All our colleges almost have received endow-

ments since their foundation.) (2) Whether they would leave the nomination in the first instance to the individuals who found it (the Heads, subsequently, being elected, as in other cases, by the Fellows). (3) Whether our friends could raise that moderate sum and place Marriott at the head of it. He is prepared, himself, to endow it, in part, out of his private property. . . .

It is of no use to complain that others are lukewarm. If they allow us to act, it is our own fault if we do not.

Mr. Gladstone thought that Government would not grant a charter unless for a plan recommended by the Bishops or those highest in station. He suggested that, in the early stages of the proposed effort, the sanction of Government might be dispensed with. Pusey pleaded that many difficulties would vanish if Government would charter a college sanctioned by ecclesiastical authorities. The Archbishop, he thought, might be induced to sanction the experiment. But who would undertake the labour of raising contributions? Pusey and Marriott would shape the plan, draw up a body of statutes, and Marriott would give himself to working it out. But then, Pusey added:—

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

April 15, 1846.

We are not the persons to originate the plan. Our lay friends proposed a plan to the University. The Comm[ittee of the Hebdomadal Board] throw cold water on a part of it, but admit of the trial being made. Have enough of them [i.e. the laymen who addressed the Heads of Houses] confidence enough in C. Marriott to carry out a part of the plan? Of course one cannot expect Lord Sandon, or Ashley, or Lord R. Grosvenor to join. The trial is independent of party, unless people make over self-denial as a characteristic of party. It is a great trial which C. Marriott proposes to make, whether by giving up his mind and energies to form young men, living with them, sharing their fare, &c., he can form them to a higher tone of Christian life than is common at our University. He is confident that, by God's help, he can; and such confidence is a good earnest. Will our lay friends put him in a position so to do? He would be sacrificing much; and I should be inclined to think that it were best for him to leave matters to that issue—if our lay friends think the trial so far worth making as to take pains about it, to look on this as God's will for him: if not, not to attempt to force his plan. But if people will not with energy carry out this plan, they have no reason to blame the Committee for their cold answer: for the Committee will only have spoken the desponding truth that whether from

our divisions, the multiplicity of other objects, the fewness of those who will exercise self-denial for a great object, people will not found a new institution like our forefathers. N[ewman] can get one founded in the Roman Church; C. Marriott cannot in the English.

If you like to show this note to A[cland] or any other, pray do.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

Keble had heard of the answer of the Hebdomadal Board to the London laymen. He supposed that it was hopeless to attempt to establish an economical college at Oxford, and was now in favour of engrafting a department for poor students in general on the Missionary College of St. Augustine which had been lately founded at Canterbury. Pusey was alarmed at so serious a defection. Without Keble's sanction he knew full well Marriott's plan would have little or no chance of success.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Pusey, April 21.

[Tuesday in 1st week after Easter, 1846.]

I have just seen a letter from Acland to my brother embodying your doubts as to a new college at Oxford, and proposing to engraft one on St. Augustine's. With regard to this, my misgiving would be, 'Are we prepared for missionaries at home?' If we could once gain the idea (and I suppose it *is* fixing itself), that we do need for our towns, mines, manufactories, real missionaries, one might hope that a new day would dawn upon our Church.

But I do not think that this supersedes the other. We want to reform habits at the Universities themselves. St. Augustine's will act only very indirectly on Oxford. A college in Oxford itself such as C. M[arriott] has conceived, in which the Head and Fellows should give a *quid pro quo* to those who would live in habits of discipline, simplicity, self-denial; living with and for those under their charge would, I trust, powerfully affect both Heads and members of other colleges. It would show that the present habits are not invincible. The change would be gradual, but it would make itself felt. The weakness of Oxford now is the want of moral influence over young men. Outward discipline will, of course, not affect this. Yet there are many, and would be more, who do wish for guidance, if the barrier which a mere system of discipline interposes could be broken through. And there are those in every college, tutors as well as young men, who would be acted upon by seeing before their eyes the working of a better system. C. M. has good confidence that much might be made of such a plan, and the confidence of such an one is a good

augury. Heads, while they entertain each other with fish, soup, turkeys, claret, perhaps champagne, of course cannot recommend simple, self-denying habits to young men. Yet there are those among the Heads who are weary of all this; some who have never wholly given in to it. I cannot but think that a very extensively beneficial effect might be produced. There are a great many minds which would take courage from such a system, and would tend, by their sympathy, to encourage and to extend it.

The answer of the Heads, cold as it is, is as much as, except at sanguine moments, I expected from them, i. e. toleration, while they did nothing themselves. They say, No good will come of it, and people will not make the attempt; but if any like it, let them try. This is all we really needed. They may slight it; one is not to expect that those educated there will be elected to scholarships or fellowships elsewhere. Better perhaps that they should not. But they may be a race of men who will make themselves felt wherever they go, even while they think themselves nothing.

I had written two letters to Gladstone before I heard of your plan, which indeed was but last night only. He entertains it, and thinks that the Government would not stickle about the person nominated as the Head if the plan generally were sanctioned, at least by some of the leading Bishops, but that they would not advise the Crown to give a charter without some such sanction—which, of course, is right. I was going to write to C. M. to ask him to draw out his plan and submit it to the Archbishop. Now if a letter can find him in time, I would suggest that he should go to confer with you at Hursley. . . .

Keble deferred to Pusey and Marriott: he had misunderstood the reply of the Heads. But he was less hopeful than were his friends about the success of such a college founded in Oxford.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, April 29, 1846.

. . . I am really quite ashamed to be so much consulted on a matter of which I know so little, and to feel that it is owing to my having talked rashly and peremptorily about it. When I took hold of the notion of St. Augustine's being applied to this purpose, or rather of a second college being founded there, I had quite supposed that the Heads had put an extinguisher on the Oxford plan. But C. M[ariott] says no, and that if the money could be found, neither they nor the Government would extinguish it, and moreover that there is quite a sufficient store of good feeling in the body of the University to hinder the plan from being quite laughed down there. If so, I am sure I should be very sorry to be the person to hinder such a plan. But it should be considered among other things, whether the Heads

would not have both the power and the will to persecute the poor clerks and their teachers pretty effectually. Also whether the advantages of public lectures (with a few exceptions) are not more apparent than real ; and whether there is not a wrong Theology so got into the air about the pulpits of Oxford, that young men would stand on the whole a better chance elsewhere. I don't urge the point of expense, as I believe C. M. is prepared to meet that. Although I make all these objections I think I incline now towards Oxford more than any other place ; but don't *quote* me, for I am writing very off-hand. . . .

Ever yours most affectionately,

J. KEBLE.

Keble wrote one more note on the subject to Pusey, while the latter was staying at Tenby in August, 1846. He was trying to 'allay the scruples' which existed generally, as he found, against placing the proposed college at Oxford. Pusey was always for Oxford as against any other site. 'Oxford,' he would say, 'is the centre : if you wish to do good generally you must work here, not in the country.' But Marriott was willing to meet the difficulty by collecting the money, if it could be collected, first, and deciding on the site afterwards. He went to see Mr. Justice Coleridge at Ottery. They agreed that three or five persons should, if possible, take the position of founders ; the names suggested were Mr. Justice Coleridge, Sir J. Awdry, Mr. Gladstone, and Archdeacons Manning and R. I. Wilberforce. They might act as one founder, and make or withdraw proposals boldly and decidedly, appeal for and receive money, in short, 'act as a snowball,' which gathers substance as it rolls on.

But Pusey's connexion with the plan was for the time cut short by the serious illness to which allusion was made at the end of the last volume. Early in the long vacation of 1846 he went with his children to Tenby, in South Wales. Before starting he spent some days with his mother in Grosvenor Square ; but they were not less busy than his days in Oxford. His sister-in-law, Lady Emily Pusey, had been alarmed at his appearance.

'I can imagine,' wrote his mother to Lady Emily on July 6, 'Edward's looking paler than when he was at Oxford, as he underwent so

much more fatigue here. Excepting the Sunday, when he dined at Mr. Dodsworth's, he did not have his dinner until between 9 and 10 o'clock at night. He was some days out of the house by 6 o'clock in the morning: always between 7 and 8. This must always tell against a frame which is not strong.'

Pusey in fact used to spend the greater part of the day at the Sisterhood in Park Village: from early in the morning until eight or nine at night, continually seeing persons who came to consult him from outside, or his spiritual children in the Sisterhood. A member of the Park Village community observes that Pusey never took a solid meal in the home. He never eat with any one. The Sisters provided some milk and coffee for him: and this, with a morsel of dry bread, was all that he took during his visits. The Sisters did what they could to persuade him to eat more. When they brought him his milk and coffee he would smile and say, quoting St. Francis of Assisi, 'You take great care of Brother Beast.' In later years he had to modify his practice very considerably. But referring to the time we are describing, he observed, 'I used to find two ways of fasting which most tired me: always taking too little, and abstaining entirely until late in the day—half-past five.' Other habits there were which tried his strength: such as kneeling himself during many hours while hearing confessions—a practice which he was obliged to abandon.

Even a few days of such a life as this were not likely to improve Pusey's health. But, as has been said, he went down to Tenby, and the change of life at first seemed to rally him. His cough grew better: and he took walks, some of them longer than his strength would permit. Soon after his arrival Marriott had visited him: and after one of their walks Pusey shewed signs of a low fever which rapidly developed into a dangerous illness. The visit of Newman to Tenby—ten months after his conversion to the Church of Rome—has been already referred to. Keble was greatly concerned: he too, at this time, was laid up, and forbidden to take work in his parish church. In writing to Pusey, he very characteristically gives the advice which illness

suggested, by describing his own reflections about himself and his work.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley, August 4, 1846.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

May I answer Miss Rogers' kind note, for which pray thank her very sincerely, to yourself? Indeed, my dear friend, we have been thinking of you much and often: we have too many things to remember you by, ever to pass a day without often thinking of you. And now I hope that God will give us the happiness of hearing that your strength is returning, and that your troublesome cough has quite left you. I have some little cough, of which the worst is that I am forbidden to do any duty for a time. It has so rarely happened to me that I scarce know how to behave myself; but I am sure it would be a [good] thing if these temporary hindrances made one feel more than one does, how little, how fearfully little, one has done for one's flock hitherto. It is indeed a feeling which ought to oppress one more than it does, when one goes into such parishes as Mr. Monro's, or such as I suppose Hook's to be, and then comes back and sees the 'nothing done,' with which one is sadly surrounded in one's place: no pastoral confidence, no work that one can see going on. Then again one considers that if one were worthy to do any good, yet one knows for certain that it is better for one not to see it: and so one tries to go on and do some little, in the hope that the least is better than nothing. . . .

Ever yours most affectionately,

J. K.

On September 1st Pusey was at last able to leave Tenby: he then spent nearly two months with his elder brother at Pusey. On his arrival, Lady Emily Pusey describes him 'as not able to dine or take any of his meals with us: in the evening he came to lie on the sofa in the drawing-room.' Her diary is, at this time, full of the details of Pusey's life—it shows how deeply she was interested in everything that concerned him and how greatly they were in sympathy with each other. Pusey used to ride almost daily with his brother or Lady Emily, or his nieces: and his health rapidly improved.

'Sept. 9.—Philip persuaded Dr. Pusey to drink some wine, which appeared to do him good.

'Sept. 27.—The weather is very beautiful to-day. Dr. Pusey went to church to-day, the first time since his illness.

'Oct. 2.—Dr. Pusey rode out to-day; great is the improvement in his health every day.

'Oct. 11.—Dr. Pusey read the second Service to us, as the rain poured in torrents.'

Before leaving his brother's house, Pusey wrote a long letter to Keble. The greater part of it is taken up with questions arising out of the translation of the 'Paradise of the Christian Soul,' and its adaptation to the use of the English Church.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Feast of St. Simon and St. Jude, Deo Gratias¹, 1846.

I have delayed writing continually, both because the health of my body was so fluctuating, that the report of one day would contradict that of the preceding, and so I had no definite time at which to thank you for your prayers and to say that thus far they had been heard, and also that I wished to write to you about outward things, before I wrote as I wished, about inward. For I felt that after I had written about inward, I could not again write about outward; at least, only as asking an opinion, not as giving one.

The outward things do not, however, amount to much. C. Marriott has asked you about the Commentary, and I am sure that the best thing for us would be to see what you have written, as you will not object, and, as far as we can, take that as our model. It has always been a puzzle with me how to write a Commentary, as well it and everything else might be—how to blend together critical and practical. I should like very much to see something done, and indeed it seems one of the great wants of our Church. . . .

I wished also to say something about your employment in the 'Library of the Fathers.' I do not like your doing what any one else can do; as indeed, I do not like it, in my own way, for myself. When we began, there was a great work and seemingly few hands, and we had to take the responsibility of it; but still my own share of it has been a good deal out of my line: it has been useful to me, I trust, in other ways, but has not helped in my own professorial duties. There are others now, who could correct St. Chrysostom, who could not write a Commentary nor a 'Lyra Innocentium.' I seem to have it on my conscience, that (although in part against my will) I have entangled you in doing what others could do, while they cannot do what you can. In this way also, 'every one hath his own gift of God.' It seemed quite natural that you should revise your brother's translation; for it does not seem fitting for a younger man: but I do not like your going

¹ This marks the day as the first anniversary of the consecration of St. Saviour's, Leeds.

on with Prevost's or what another can do. It is a weight upon me. . . .

And now, having read the enclosed, will you give me some penitential rules for myself? I hardly know what I can do.

From this point the letter passes to 'inward things.' His illness had led Pusey to consider whether he could not work harder and be stricter with himself than heretofore; in fact it contains an application to Mr. Keble with regard to his own inner life which will have presently to be dealt with more fully.

CHAPTER IV.

PENITENCE AND CONFESSION.

1846.

‘The Golden Keys each eve and morn,
I see them with a heart forlorn,
Lest they should Iron prove to me—
O set my heart at liberty.
May I seize what Thou dost give,
Seize tremblingly and live.’

Lyra Apostolica, xvi.

IT was not surprising that during the long hours of Pusey's sickness and slow recovery in the autumn of 1846, he should feel more intensely than ever that solemn sense of personal sinfulness which had weighed upon him continuously through his life.

In his sermon on ‘The Entire Absolution of the Penitent’ he dealt in his own thorough way with the whole question of the doctrine and practice of Confession and Absolution, and with the Church authority for both. It is not necessary therefore here to shew that though the general practice of confession had died out in the English Church before the Church movement commenced, yet the theory and principle of personal confession and absolution was part and parcel of the system of the Church of England, recognized in Prayer-book and Canons, and supported by a long catena of sound Anglican divines. Moreover, the accidental allusions in history to its regular use by eminent ecclesiastics and laymen, though not very frequent, are of such a character as to shew that it was looked on as nothing foreign or exotic in the life of the Church of England.

At several moments of his earlier life Pusey had been forced by illness, or by trouble, to that solemn and searching converse with conscience which confession at once expresses and relieves. Thus, after his illness in 1831, we find him writing to Newman :—

‘I fear that often the desire of attaining some which I thought a great end, and the consciousness of being engaged in a good cause, has engrossed me too entirely, and made me think of my existence too much in reference to what might be accomplished by my means here, instead of looking pre-eminently to the preparing myself to meet my God.’

Again, his wife’s death in 1839 appeared to him to be a punishment for his own sins.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

May 7, 1839.

You will pray for me that I may humbly and penitently resign her to Him Who gave her to me, and that the sins may be forgiven me for which, out of the usual order of His dealings, she, once so strong, is taken from me.

Pusey, to use his own words, dreaded his love of occupation, as a diversion from that close dealing with conscience which might lead to a true self-knowledge. It was in order to fix and deepen the sense of sin that he had offered, as an unnamed penitent, to build a church in Leeds. He looked upon his suspension in 1843 as a punishment for ‘secret faults’¹. When his daughter Lucy died he wrote in the same strain. Her death was a ‘punishment for his sins.’ Keble deprecated this view: Pusey still insisted on it. ‘I am indeed,’ he wrote to Keble in April, 1844, ‘in earnest that all my sorrows are the fruits of my own sins, and all my chastisements so many mercies. “Ut nos hic urere et purgare, et in aeternum parcere digneris.”’

This being the state of his mind, and since in his public and private teaching he constantly insisted on the gravity of post-baptismal sin, and on the reality of the absolving power lodged in the Church, it was inevitable that the question of making use of Confession himself should now

¹ ‘Entire Absolution of the Penitent,’ p. 1.

present itself, with increasing urgency, as a matter of personal duty. Especially when others came to him to make confessions, and to receive absolution, he must have asked himself whether he ought not to do as they did. But it must be remembered that, neither now nor at any other time in his life, did he treat the practice of private confession as a matter of absolute obligation on the part of any one. Besides, he had extreme difficulties in his own case. He was so overwhelmed with the consciousness of his sins that he shrunk from making a confessor of one of those friends with whom he was associated in common work, and outside this circle there was no one whom he could choose as a spiritual guide.

A full idea of his feelings and difficulties in the matter may be gathered from a letter addressed to Keble a few months later. Indeed, it is a letter so sacred in its confidence that a biographer might well shrink from publishing it, but at the same time it cannot well be withheld, if Pusey's sense of personal sinfulness and of the gravity of sin is to be rightly understood.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

St. Cyprian's Day (Sept. 26), 1844.

I must pain you in return far more than what you say can pain me. I am quite unfit to think anything or express anything, one way or the other, about what you tell me, except that it seems a marvellous part of God's dealings with people in our Church, that He is giving them such quickened apprehensions of sin. But as you give me a hint that you might ask an opinion of me, I must speak, though it will very much pain you. My dear wife's illness first brought to me, what has since been deepened by the review of my past life, how, amid special mercies and guardianship of God, I am scarred all over and seamed with sin, so that I am a monster to myself; I loathe myself; I can feel of myself only like one covered with leprosy from head to foot; guarded as I have been, there is no one with whom I do not compare myself, and find myself worse than they; and yet, thus wounded and full of sores, I am so shocked at myself, that I dare not lay my wounds bare to any one: since I have seen the benefit of confession to others, I have looked round whether I could unburthen myself to any one, but there is a reason against every one. I dare not so shock people: and so I go on, having no such comfort as in good Bp. Andrewes' words, to confess myself 'an unclean worm, a dead



my sincerely yours
J. Keble.



dog, a putrid corpse,' and pray Him to heal my leprosy as He did on earth, and to raise me from the dead : to give me sight, and to forgive me the 10,000 talents ; and I must guide myself as best I can, because, as things are, I dare not seek it elsewhere.

You will almost be surprised that, being such, I should attempt, as I do, to guide any. I cannot help it. Those whom I in any way guide were brought to me, and by experience or reading, or watching God's guidance of them, I do what I can, and God Who loves them has blessed them through me, though unworthy. But I am trying to learn to wish to influence nothing on any great scale ; to prefer, I mean, every one's judgment to my own, and only to act for myself as I best may, and for any souls whom He employs me any way to minister to. When I can, it is a comfort to use words classing myself with other sinners : it is a sort of disowning of what people make of me. I hope all this will not shock you too much, or do you harm ; the real testimony to the life of the Church is not in such as me but in simple people, such as my own dear child : He is working marvels among such ; it quite amazes me to see His work with individual souls. So then pray be not dismayed at what I write. I have not said so much to any one for fear of dismaying them. It seemed as if I had no right. But there is abundant, super-abundant proof of God's great grace with people's souls in our Church, though I am a poor miserable leper. . . .

I grieve thus to grieve you, but I cannot help it.

Ever your unworthy but still affectionate

E. B. P.

Such language as this, the reader will bear in mind, must not be construed by the ordinary use of conventional language even in Christian society. But it is rather the expression of that estimate of human sin and of the sinner's utter unworthiness in the sight of God which underlies, for instance, the language of the General Confession in the Prayer-book, and which in all ages has been characteristic of those really advanced in holiness of life. St. Paul was not hyperbolical when he called himself 'the chief' of sinners. Similar thoughts about themselves have been entertained by saints of all ages—by the dying Augustine ; by St. Francis of Assisi and Bishop Andrewes ; by St. Vincent de Paul and John Bunyan ; by St. Francis of Sales and John Wesley ; by St. Philip Neri and Charles Simeon. Pusey's guide and correspondent, Keble, also habitually wrote and expressed himself, with reference to his own life,

in similar terms. His penitence, it has been said, poured itself out in language which to many would seem extravagant; and he could speak of 'self-aborrence as a duty, a necessity, and a joy¹.'

This language of saintly men has always been misunderstood; it has been thought by some to be unreal, and by others to point to the practice of heinous sin, of which they were absolutely guiltless. For instance, Charles Simeon had written of himself:—

'I scarcely ever join in the confession of our Church without perceiving, almost as with my bodily organs, my soul as a dead and putrified carcass; and I join in that acknowledgment, "There is no health in us," in a way that none but God Himself can conceive².'

And in consequence of this temper one of his friends thought that 'his frequent sighs and groans were indications of something habitually and essentially wrong in his conduct³.' The truth, of course, is that with nearness to God comes a new and more exacting standard of sin and holiness: and sins of temper or of self-assertion are naturally referred to in terms which the blunted sensibilities of men of the world would only apply to the grossest acts of wickedness. 'I have heard of Thee,' cried the saint of old, 'by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes⁴.'

Pusey's indecision on this matter was brought to a close, partly by the extreme mental distress which followed on Newman's secession, and partly by the new and constraining stimulus to his conscience which had been occasioned by his sermon in February, 1846, on the 'Entire Absolution of the Penitent.' He is thinking of himself when, as was his wont, he speaks in general terms, 'People have through years of life purposed to confess (if God enable them) at their death. But what instinctive reverence for Almighty God tells them should be done before death, should, if possible, be done in life⁵.' The illness at Tenby caused him finally to make

¹ Lock's 'Biography of John Keble,' p. 233.

² Carus, 'Memoirs of Charles Simeon,' 3rd ed., p. 363.

³ Ibid., p. 520.

⁴ Job xlii. 5, 6.

⁵ 'Entire Absolution of the Penitent,' ed. 1845, Preface, p. iv.

up his mind. Those who know anything of the experiences of the human soul can recognize in the course of such events as these the leadings of God's providence.

On his returning to Oxford after this illness in the autumn of 1846, he first of all wrote to Keble, asking for some rules for himself as a penitent:—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Feast of St. Simon and St. Jude, Deo gratias, 1846.

MY DEAREST FRIEND,

. . . Will you give me some penitential rules for myself? I hardly know what I can do, just now, in a bodily way, for nourishment I am ordered; sleep I must take when it comes; cold is bad for me; and I know not whether I am strong enough to resume the hair-cloth. However, I hope to try. But I should like to do something because I am bid; for I am weary of being under no authority; and yet I have not, I suppose, been under any, any way, for nearly twenty years. For although at one time I wished to fancy myself under a Bishop, I yet really am under none, and do, in everything almost, what I will; which is an unnatural state. I can hardly make rules for myself which take time: in health one employment treads on another, and except perhaps in Passion Week, and not always then, I have no interruption of occupation: so that my whole life is irregular. I do mostly what I can, when I can: and anything I set myself, I can dispense myself from, for some seeming charity.

God bless you ever and requite you all your kindness.

Yours affectionately, but His most unworthy servant,

E. B. P.

Keble's humble nature shrank from taking Pusey at his word. He thought that the troubles of the time were 'providential modes of real penance, whereby one is mercifully permitted to supply the want of those more direct and outward penances which one naturally thinks of in the first place, but which in His inscrutable wisdom and goodness, God often seems to interdict.' Pusey, in reply, wrote on the same day (All Saints' Day, 1846), begging Keble to hear his confession. Keble assented, and after some allusions to the date, added: 'Do not punish yourself *too* sharply in the meantime. I suppose compunction of heart is the thing: and if that is longer kept up by a less measure of outward rigour, the less should be preferred.'

Into the preparation for his confession Pusey carried the

whole intensity of his character. He gave a full month to the work. His letters to Keble show how the sense of sin possessed and depressed him. He could no longer address Keble as friend, but only as 'father': he was unworthy to sign himself 'your very affectionate,' and substituted 'grateful' or 'unworthy.' Keble could not allow this to pass without notice. 'I beseech you,' he wrote, 'do not leave off calling me friend.' Pusey proposed to go for the occasion to a lodging in Hursley; he wished 'to make a sort of Retreat.' He would not go to the vicarage as a visitor. He even shrank from using Hursley Church for his confession: 'I could not bear,' he wrote, 'to associate your altar with my miseries.' 'Come to me,' he wrote afterwards, 'please, when it suits you; but when you come, come as God's priest: if I might ask, do not shake hands, or—anything of this world.'

Pusey had also been importunate in begging Keble for a rule of penitential discipline.

'As to directing you,' answered Keble, 'I know I shall be utterly bewildered, were it only from ignorance and inexperience. You must really think beforehand what is most likely to do you good. Mere suffering is the first and simplest thought: but then there are duties to be done. And have we a right to disqualify ourselves for them? Is it not best to leave it to the Almighty to do so if He see fit, by sickness?'

Pusey could not rest in these general considerations, however incontrovertible. He must have some definite prescription: but he would furnish his guide with the knowledge of his own condition, which might enable him to write it.

'I am,' he wrote, 'a great coward about inflicting pain on myself, partly, I hope, from a derangement of my nervous system; hair-cloth I know not how to make pain: it is only symbolical, except when worn to an extent which seemed to wear me out. I have it on again, by God's mercy. I would try to get some sharper sort. Lying hard I like best, unless it is such as to take away sleep, and that seems to unfit me for duties. Real fasting, i.e. going without food, was very little discomfort, except in the head, when the hour of the meal was over, and Dr. W[ootten] said and says, "It was shortening my life." Praying with my arms in the form of a cross seemed to distract

me, and act upon my head, from this same miserable nervousness. I think I should like to be bid to use the discipline. I cannot even smite on my breast much because the pressure on my lungs seemed bad. In short, you see, I am a mass of infirmities. But I might be able to do something, in faith, if I was bid to do it.'

Before however Pusey could complete this duty of making his confession, he had to discharge another which he would willingly have postponed or delegated to other hands. He had promised some months before to take his turn as University preacher on Advent Sunday, Nov. 29; and a sermon always made a great demand on his thought and time, until it was over. Now he had at the same time to prepare for the University pulpit, and for making his Confession.

The subject of the sermon was already determined on. On St. Luke's Day, October 18, Dr. Jeune, the Master of Pembroke College, when preaching before the University, had attacked Pusey for his sermon on Absolution in the preceding February. Pusey had 'neither time nor strength of head' to reply as he could have wished: but having written something, he sent the polemical part of his sermon to Keble.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church [Nov. 12], 1846.

... Will you kindly look at these pages? Dr. Jeune preached on St. Luke's Day a sermon against Confession (which he has since published), pulling mine to pieces, quoting passages throughout, trying to show Confession to be Roman not English, and saying that one who taught as I do is 'a Romanist.' Connecting this with the difficulties of Bittlestone in the diocese of Worcester, I thought it might be good to vindicate the use of Confession as Anglican. The whole of this is really an answer to Dr. Jeune, but I have not used his words, nor alluded to him otherwise than in p. 1, 'since it has been denied.'

Dr. J. puts the question upon a fair issue, (1) that we are not allowed to use the Form in the Visitation for the Sick in private confessions: (2) that it does not mean to remit sins, but to absolve from Church censures. In both, of course, he must fail: so that it is good ground, if one may take it, and at the same time brings before people again the question whether it may not be a duty to them.

Yours very gratefully,

E. B. P.

Keble replied at once :—

‘I see nothing for which I am not very thankful in your “part of a sermon.” One is sorry that the pulpit should be a place of exceptions and rejoinders. But, in this case, I scarce see how it could be helped.’

The sermon is an Advent sermon to which a polemical turn is imparted by the necessity of replying to Dr. Jeune. It dwells less on the absolving power than on the duty and happiness of true repentance. The text, ‘Whose sins ye remit they are remitted,’ is exchanged for, ‘If we would judge ourselves we should not be judged.’ The preacher does indeed traverse Dr. Jeune’s two positions. To the arbitrary assumption that the confession and absolution which the Prayer-book prescribes for the sick room might not be used on other private occasions, Pusey answers in effect that the Church, having allowed the efficacy of absolution of sins, cannot conceivably limit its use by the physical condition of the sinner, and that at any rate the need of confession is often not less felt in health than in sickness. To the theory that the absolution in the Visitation Service relates only to the removal of Church censures, Pusey rejoins that the portion of the old Latin form which might have been understood to relate to such censures is omitted from the English office, and that part only is retained which directly relates to the remission of *sins*. In the case of public Church censures, the priest would be already well-informed, and there would be no need of confession: the absolution is given for sins disclosed in confession, of which the priest previously knew nothing. ‘What waste,’ exclaims the preacher, ‘of precious moments on which eternity may hang, to “move the sick to confess *sins*,” and then in solemn words, which sinful men may well tremble to use, to “absolve him,” if truly penitent, “from all his *sins*,” if this solemn act is not of value to his soul, or relates only to Church censures, under which these sins do not come¹.’

But the predominant elements of the sermon are of

¹ ‘Entire Absolution of the Penitent,’ Sermon. ii. pp. 14, 15. (Univ. Sermon. vol. i. ser. iii.)

a personal and devotional kind ; and they are lighted up with a new meaning when we know, as none of his hearers knew at the time, that the preacher himself had been going through a great spiritual struggle to attain to true penitence, and that he was even then practising what he was preaching. He is speaking to himself in such a passage as the following :—

‘Penitent thyself thou shalt learn to speak to the hearts of penitents. Thou knowest too well the wounds which enter the soul ; thou wilt know the healing wherewith the Great Physician shall have healed thee. Thou knowest the sorrows and plague of thine own heart ; thou wilt know the comfort, wherewith thou shalt be comforted of God¹.’

In the evening of the day Pusey wrote to his mother, ‘All is well, and I too, by God’s mercy. Sermon 1¼ long. A little tired in the afternoon, but not in the evening.’

On the following Tuesday, December 1, he went to Hursley and made his confession ; and before leaving he sent a thank-offering in money for Hursley Church, ‘from one who feels himself unworthy to offer it himself.’ A day or two later he wrote more at length.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Oxford, Dec. 7, 1846.

MY DEAREST FATHER,

I dare not write much, yet thus much I may say, in comfort for all the sorrow I gave you last week, that I cannot doubt but that through your ministry and the power of the keys, I have received the grace of God, as I know not that I ever did before. I can no more doubt of His mercy vouchsafed to me thus far, than of my own past misery. All indeed is very bad. . . . However, things seem with me other than they ever were before ; at least, I seem to hate myself more thoroughly, and, bad as my prayers are, still to have a love and hope I never knew before. So although, through my wretchedness, you have seen that what is seeming may be hollow, yet through God’s unbounded mercy you will have seen anew that His grace is vouchsafed through His Ordinances to penitents, however fallen. You will pray that it be not in vain. You will know, in some little measure, what a hard task is before me. To think of myself as last in God’s sight (had He made me such) would be nothing ; but to feel that I have had gifts of nature and drawings, above others, and to feel that this wreck is my own making, it is very bitter. . . . May it only be

¹ ‘Entire Absolution of the Penitent.’ Sermon. ii. pp. 41, 42.

healing. And then I found my late sermon printed. Alas! what a key you have to it. I hardly know how I could have got through it now. Oh, that that miserable, miserable thing should be I! Yet I trust, by His mercy, it is no more I. It ought to have cut one's heart open to read it. However, do not think (I pray) that I need comfort. It seems to me the most blessed sorrow (when occupation does not take it away) I ever felt. God would not deal thus with me, if He had not pardoned me.

May God requite you.

In Him your very affectionate and grateful son,

E. B. P.

Pusey had brought with him a disciplinary rule of life for himself, which Keble was to sanction. Its chief peculiarity is its definite and practical character. It was not an attempt to regulate feelings or states of mind, but to shape life by practical efforts. Nor does it seem to have been taken from any known external source whatever: it was suggested by his own experience.

Some of these rules were of an ascetic description, which the majority of people in our day cannot even understand much less admire, but which may not on that account be less valuable, at any rate in some cases, in forming the Christian character. Pusey, under the guidance of the Apostle's habit of keeping his body under subjection¹, made rules for all his outward life, with Keble's sanction. He resolved, for instance, to be in bed by eleven o'clock if possible: to rise at six, after giving 'five minutes to collect himself and commend himself to God'; to wear hair-cloth always by day unless ill; to use a hard seat by day, and a hard bed by night; not to wear gloves or protect his hands; to travel as poorly as possible, except when health, or pressure of time, or duty to his mother, obliged him to do otherwise; to eat his food slowly, and penitentially, 'making a secret confession of unworthiness to use God's creatures, before every meal'; not to take wine or beer, unless obliged to do so by a physician; to abstain, as strictly as his physician would permit; never to notice

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 27. The original is much stronger: ὑπωπιάζω . . . δουλαγωγῶ.

anything unpleasant in what was set on table, but to take it by preference, and in a penitential spirit.

But if the body was to be mortified, much more the mind. Pusey resolved 'to mortify curiosity in all the ways I can'; to look at nothing out of curiosity; to keep the eyes down when walking, except for the sight of nature, associating himself mentally with the Publican; to ask himself before reading anything whether it was God's will that he should read it; never to set aside solid work in order to read newspapers or letters. His rules about the use of speech will explain to those who can remember it the peculiarities of his conversation; its stern repression of all humour, its profound seriousness, its unexpected pauses and silences, its grave and charitable protests. He determined 'not to speak of himself or of his work, whenever he could help doing so; to blame another only after asking himself the question, "Would my Lord have me say it?" and to accompany the blame by an act of self-humiliation; to soften, if possible, any unfavourable judgment of others that he heard; to give way in argument wherever it was not a duty to maintain his opinion; to avoid excitement or jesting when speaking, except when with children, "as unfit for me"; to pray daily for *συνότης*¹; to interrupt no one else when speaking; to stop, if interrupted; to give way if another should begin speaking at the same time; never to argue in Chapter against any opinion of — (except for some grave cause), but, at most, simply to explain; never to complain of anything which happens either to himself or to the Church, since his own sins were the cause of the one, and might contribute to the other; never to mention bodily pain except as an explanation of silence which might be misunderstood; always to acknowledge ignorance of a subject, unless it was inexpedient, as distinct from humiliating, to do so; to address every one, especially inferiors in rank, as his superiors in the sight of God; to thank all who waited on him heartily, and calling to mind that he did not deserve anything at their hands.'

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 4, 8.

Pusey did nothing by halves ; and he resolved to bring his devotions and his ministerial work under the domain of penitential rule. The sense of penitence was to colour all the departments of prayer and even praise. He would join in Intercessions, 'as unfit to be heard for any one'; in the *Gloria Patri* and *Pater noster*, as 'unworthy to take on my lips the Name I have so dishonoured'; in professions of duty in the Psalms, as 'what I would do, but the contrary of what I have done'; in Thanksgiving, 'to thank God that I am not in hell, and for my absolution, and that the devil did not enter into me altogether, as he did into Judas'; in the responses after the Commandments, so as to 'pray for the conversion of the worst sinners—myself chief.' He also resolved :—

'To pray God to enable me to pray before each break in the Service, at the beginning of Psalms, Canticles, before singing Creeds, hearing each Lesson, and three times in the Litany, and before Communion service, and immediately after any distraction, and then to try to throw my whole soul into the prayers; to write down how often I omit this.'

Other resolves about devotions were :—

'To repeat the Penitential Psalms or verses of them when walking alone, or in Chapter. Always to repeat any prayer in which I have been distracted [during the Church service] as fervently as I can, as soon as I may, after returning home. To pray for some grace at every Communion, and be watchful to treasure it, and now, at first, at least, humble penitential love. To pray God daily for any trouble which may be good for my soul, and not injure the Church. To pray God daily, if it be good for me, to give me sharp bodily pain before I die, and His Grace in it.'

The same spirit was carried into his ministerial work ; he was to do everything in the spirit of a penitent. He would 'aim at commencing every ministerial act with inward confession,' that he was 'so very unfit to be a minister of God.' Another rule was, 'Always in taking my place in the Cathedral, or on going to the Altar, to make an act of humiliation, as one who ought to be shut out from it. The first shall be last.' Another, 'To hear all the very worst confessions, very penitentially, as worse myself.' Another, 'To give advice or opinion to any person, as

being unfit to speak. "O take not the word of Thy Truth utterly out of my mouth." Another, 'In any undertaking or plan, as in the case of St. Saviour's or the Sisters, or thinking or praying for them, to pray God that it be not marred through my sins.' Another, 'Not to desire to minister to any one, as being unfit, but to pray God that it may be as is best for their souls, and that if [I do minister to them] I may learn of them.' Another, 'To minister to holy persons (as —, —, &c.), as so very unfit even to be with them.'

Other rules were to deal with general habits:—

'To aim to offer all acts to God and to pray for His grace in them before commencing them, as conversations, while people are coming into the room or before I enter a room, each separate letter which I write, *each* course of study, and in the course of each of these, if continued long, and His pardon at the end, and note down omissions.

'Never, if I can, to look at beauty of nature, without inward confession of unworthiness.

'To make mental acts, from time to time, of being inferior to every one I see [especially the poor, or when preaching, or the neglected, or the very degraded, or children, or if I catch any one's eyes].

'To drink cold water at dinner, as only fit to be where there is not a drop "to cool this flame."

'To make the fire to me from time to time the type of hell.

'Always to lie down in bed, confessing that I am unworthy to lie down except in hell, but so praying to lie down in the Everlasting Arms.

'Whenever I cannot take the last place outwardly, to take it inwardly.

'To make act of internal humiliation, whenever any mark of outward respect is shown me (as by young men, college servants, &c. at Christ Church).'

Pusey made rules also to help him in bringing every thought under the constant empire of rule. He would aim at not letting his imagination dwell on unreal circumstances or situations, but to drive all thoughts of this life away, except of what is actual or impending. When thoughts arose which were the consequence of past sins, he would say, 'Lord, have mercy.' When enabled to think anything in any way good, he would thank God as quickly as he could, 'if only by one thought.' He would impress on himself that 'nothing is my own but my sins.'

Pusey proposed some rules which his adviser disallowed. Keble was anxious lest Pusey should humble himself at the expense of others. 'One is not,' he wrote, 'always to say what one really thinks of oneself, even when in some respects the subject might seem to call for it.' In the same way, Pusey must be careful not to do harm to social inferiors by expressing his sense of moral inferiority to them. As to those points there was no difficulty: but there were others behind. Pusey was very anxious 'to use "the discipline" every night with Psalm 51.' Keble did not advise it. Pusey entreated. 'I still scruple,' wrote Keble, 'about the discipline. I could but allow, not enjoin it to any one.' Another rule which Pusey begged to have set him was, 'Not to smile, if I can help it, except with children, or when it seems a matter of love (like one who has just escaped the fire).' But Keble hesitated. 'I should not be honest,' he wrote, 'were I not to confess that I cannot yet reconcile myself to the not smiling. Is it not a penalty on others, more than on oneself?' Pusey's proposal not to read letters when he was engaged in serious work, in order to mortify curiosity, leads Keble to observe, 'I suppose the rule about reading letters relates to the time when you receive them; my temptation often is rather to leave them unread.' Keble, who was fond of saying that we may always learn from those to whom we minister, when returning the rules wrote to Pusey: 'May I copy those of the rules which seem as if they would help me? Of course not any which you would rather not.' Whatever he may have thought of this, Pusey could not but consent: he sent Keble a copy of the rules, adding:—

'Forgive me if I cannot but be anxious that you should not put upon yourself what is only for such as me. I am naturally of strong constitution: you are not. . . . Again, I cannot compose out walking; you can. To me then to repeat Penitential Psalms is to escape idleness (and it is very badly done at the best). From you it might take away some of the little leisure you have to write for the children of the Church.'

Keble writes in reply:—

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley, 2nd Wed. in Advent [Dec. 9], 1846.

My dearest Friend, and Son that ought to be Father, and something more than I can say,—

It is but little that I can write to you just now—little in every sense, compared with what it ought to be—but God be thanked if He has made His precious gifts available to you through the like of me: but what if I should myself be *ἀδόκιμος*—will not all this greatly add to my burden? You must pray for me, you must indeed, for I really told you the simple truth about myself, and though He has been very merciful to me, I know I am very very wanting—callous as I sometimes feel, at other times it quite frightens me to think of other persons' contrition whose story is nothing like so shameful as mine: but enough of this just now. Only do pray simply that I may be contrite—that is really what I want and need. You need not fear my treating myself too austere: my tendencies and habits, I am sorry to say, lie far too much the other way, and circumstances besides are against it: yet I hope that by His great blessing the having your Rules by me will be of use: were it only for the feeling of shame which will come over one at the thought of such a thing being in one's desk while one is all ease and comfort. At the same time, when I think of all your illnesses, I half repent of having put my name to some of the outward Rules: but you really must remember that they are your own not mine, I being so soft and so ignorant, and that I can ill afford to bear the responsibility of bringing any sort of illness upon you. For my sake, and for all our sakes, be not hard upon yourself—remember what is said about 'often infirmities.' If it were not for painning you, I should scruple about your kind and too-large gift to Hursley Church: it is not a case of pressing need, and I am not afraid of funds falling short: but as it is I can only say, God make it a blessing to you, and repay you a thousandfold all the comfort and help you have been and are to me: but I try to make allowance for that—and now no more about self.

I hope before this time you will have great comfort from your London journey—mine was merely about external matters; but there were a great many comfortable things, and I do hope matters are rather settling among us. My dear wife continues pretty well and very grateful to you. Accept both our kind love—and believe me, my dear son, yet fatherly friend, your very affectionate father in Christ (is it not almost too daring to say so?),

J. K.

The spiritual relationship thus established between Pusey and Keble continued until the death of the latter in 1866. Three times at least in every year Pusey went to Hursley

in order to make his confession; and the times of these visits were also used by the friends for talking over urgent religious questions. In one sense this arrangement must be regretted, at least by the biographer; as much of the highest interest which would otherwise have survived in correspondence was thus irrecoverably lost.

Pusey's rule of life which Keble thus sanctioned was a rule for himself. It was the product of his own mind, and it was suited to his own case and temperament. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that he recommended it for general use: every soul, he used to say, has its own history, and must be treated separately. In advising others he was wont to be indulgent as to matters in which he was severe with himself: 'You live in the world,' he would say, 'more than I do, and you would naturally do this or that'; or 'You have not much constitution to fall back on, and must not attempt too much.' Though his language in speaking of faults of temper or of self-assertion in his own case was as vehement as we have seen, he would deal in a spirit of the utmost gentleness with far graver faults in the case of others.

In addition to all these rules for his life, it must be borne in mind that, as has already been said, he had, ever since his wife's death in 1839, avoided all social gatherings. He refrained from dining with his brother Canons in Chapter; and he begged Archdeacon Manning, when staying at Cuddesdon with Bishop Wilberforce, to save him from an invitation which it would be difficult either to accept or to decline. About this time he wrote to his eldest brother, who had asked him to a dinner-party at Pusey, in the following terms:—

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ.

[Undated, but 1845 or 1846.]

I had rather say in writing that I feel myself more and more unfit for anything like a dinner-party. It does not suit me in health, or any way, body or mind. It is now six years since I have dined out, although when in your own house I have gladly seen the friends you kindly wished to see me.

But it is an understood thing among my friends that I do not dine

out, and I should get into endless inconsistencies by meeting friends at dinner at your house whom I do not meet elsewhere. Thus to-day a friend declined for me an invitation to meet Gladstone and Hook and other friends from Lord Wicklow on the ground that I had left off dining out for years. Of course, you and Lord W. are very different, but still I have now an answer everywhere; whereas if I once begin again it is very difficult to stop, and to refuse to meet the same persons elsewhere. Yet I never feel so little satisfied with myself as at a party of any sort, and I shrink from any step towards getting back to them.

I am really sorry not to do anything you wish me to do, but my present life of comparative loneliness seems to me to have been marked out for me by God's Providence, and I find myself best thus.

Your very affectionate brother,

E. B. P.

Pusey's solitary life was in harmony with a standard and practices of penitence which others could only attempt at some risk of unreality; but his example is not on that account the less valuable. All the world cannot, and should not if it could, wear a hermit's garb and live austere: but the example of the Baptist is not therefore less valuable, as a reformer of society no less than as a saint of God, for men of all nations and of all time.

CHAPTER V.

ST. SAVIOUR'S, LEEDS—THE FIRST HARVEST OF DISAPPOINTMENT.

1847.

THE Church of St. Saviour's, Leeds, was the offering of a penitent. But no penitent, intent upon providing himself with those opportunities of a true self-discipline which arise out of the disappointment of our dearest hopes, could have done better for himself than was done for Pusey by the early history of the church for which he had made so many sacrifices. That history was full of bitter mortifications. Two series of secessions to Rome in 1847 and 1851, and the outward estrangement of his old friend Dr. Hook during a long term of years, might at that time have seemed to be the only results of Pusey's great effort.

It would be unnecessary to enter into all the wearisome details of the disasters at St. Saviour's and of the personal differences between two good men like Pusey and Hook, if it were not for two reasons. The events at St. Saviour's, some account of which has already been given to the world, have always been supposed to reflect seriously on Pusey's character for wisdom and loyalty; it seems required therefore that a more complete narrative should now be given. But there is a more important reason for entering into the matter. The troubles at St. Saviour's illustrate very aptly the difficulty, at the moment, of an understanding between the different sections of Churchmen, and the variety of their methods, if not of their attitude, towards Rome.

The first Vicar of St. Saviour's was the Rev. Richard Ward. His appointment had given great satisfaction to Dr. Hook, who at this time knew more of him than Pusey did, and who also recommended him for the appointment. In Lent 1846, there were at the Vicarage of St. Saviour's four clergy besides the Vicar; the number was increased in May. Besides the daily morning and evening Services in the church, they observed some of the Hours of Prayer at home. The Holy Communion was celebrated on Sundays and Holy days. Their poor neighbours welcomed them with the generosity with which, when left to themselves, the poor will welcome any effort to help them to higher things; and, at first, the neighbouring clergy were friendly, some of them even intimate.

Mr. Ward, however, finding himself unable to control and make the most of this concentration of religious force at St. Saviour's, invited Pusey to spend a considerable portion of the Long Vacation at Leeds. This was, of course, impossible. In the late autumn, however, Pusey sent the Rev. R. G. Macmullen to Leeds, in the hope that he might be able to organize and invigorate the work. When he arrived the situation was somewhat strained. Mr. Ward had just published a Manual for Communicants, some features of which gave umbrage to Dr. Hook; he had also, with questionable prudence, introduced into the Parochial Library the Littlemore 'Lives of the Saints.' A translation of the Breviary, or of portions of it, adapted to the use of the English Church, was in use by the clergy of St. Saviour's in the prayer-room at the Vicarage, in addition to the morning and evening service of the Church of England at the church. And, with regard to all this, a great many incorrect rumours had reached the ears of the Vicar of Leeds. Mr. Macmullen's arrival threw new life and energy into everything. The schools were better organized and attended to; the Wednesday class rose from twenty or thirty to double that number; catechizing on Sunday afternoons was commenced; and the church was crowded on Sunday

evenings with listeners to his pointed and effective sermons.

But he also helped to bring matters to a crisis. On All Saints' Day he preached a sermon on the Intercession of the Saints. It would be very difficult to prove the sermon to be condemned by any formulary of the Church of England; but a complaint concerning it was made to the Bishop of Ripon. The Bishop ruled that it was not contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, but that its silence on certain points was 'objectionable.' Hook wrote a somewhat bitter remonstrance to Pusey. The clergy of St. Saviour's, he said, were undoing all that he had been endeavouring to do for ten years. They were strengthening the hands of infidelity; they were using the Church of England to propagate the principles of Popery; in fact they were unprincipled men, against whom he would wage a war of extermination. Of Pusey himself Hook complains that he had planted 'a colony of Papists' in the heart of Leeds.

'You have sent Mr. Macmullen here, and he is acting as Curate, without the Bishop's licence; I hope the Bishop, now that he knows this [respecting the sermon], will send him to the right-about; so that when, having done Romish work in England, he goes over to the Popish Church, where his heart is, he may not refer to this clandestine act¹ as a proof of there being no discipline among us.'

Hook wrote strongly, as feeling indignant: he could, he said, honour open enemies; he despised traitors. He was no longer as heretofore 'yours affectionately,' but only 'yours truly.'

Pusey, however, knew how to turn away wrath by a soft answer.

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. HOOK.

Christ Church,

22nd Sunday after Trinity [Nov. 8], 1846.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

There is some dreadful misunderstanding somewhere. We have been labouring together these many years for our common Mother, have 'walked in the house of God as friends'; you formerly

¹ i. e. his officiating in Leeds without a licence.

have risked your life for her and for her children. I have in the last year. I felt before my illness that I had been overworked, I was worn out: I laboured often night as well as day; I had not a feeling of health for more than a whole year of toil and sorrow. I felt that I could not stand it. But what could I do? God brought me at that perilous crisis work to do, often thankless; I cast away everything, so that I might, by God's mercy, retain children of our Church within her. What the extent of misgiving was then, you probably can never know. There was an extensive gloom and despondency among persons who loved our Church and desired to remain in her. I speak strictly when I say that people (clergy also) seemed (in the language of Holy Scripture) 'like the ripe fig, ready to drop into the mouth of the eater'; they were panic-stricken; and as men in a panic needed to be reassured. They seemed bewildered. What a gap *they* stood in, who at that time cheered their brethren by their own confidence and faithfulness to the Church of England, God knows: I suppose man will never know. May *He* forgive the imperfections of any of us in so doing, Whom in it we desired to serve, and accept our imperfect service, although men call us 'traitors' for it. We are men, my dear friend, frail fallible men; I am a sinner, chief of sinners; I cannot doubt that I have not the discernment I should have had, had I been holier; I do not vindicate anything I did; it was, of course, full of imperfections; but I was not and am not a 'traitor'; I risked, as I said, everything for the Church of England: had I had any misgiving, I could not have done what I did; I did faithfully, according to the wisdom which God gave me, what I did, as to Him, and for His Church, of which He has made me, unworthy, a minister, and I do trust that He overruled my imperfections to His ends, and that you, my dear friend, will live to see the fruit of our joint toils and of those of His other servants.

All this is a long tale about *I*; I do not, in itself, mind if any one blames me; I deserve it, if not for what they blame, yet for something else; but these 'unhappy divisions' are doing countless harm, and therefore I wish to clear myself to you, not of miserable imperfections, but of having any other end than that of performing, according to the ability He has given me, the office He has assigned me as a minister of the Church of England.

The conflux of clergy at the consecration of St. Saviour's was no doing of mine; my only thought in the course of sermons which were preached was to win souls to Christ. But God did make it an occasion of strengthening many a faint heart; and if you could know how devoted ministers of the Church of England, not yielding to yourself in loyalty to her, have thanked me with tears in their eyes for my labours during the past year, you would think otherwise of me than you do.

And now, my dear friend, let me tell you that I stand on no other ground than yourself, that of Ken, Andrewes, and Bramhall—the primitive, undivided Church. . . .

In principle, surely then, my dear friend, we are one; and if in details we differ, or if you think it your duty to speak against the Church of Rome, and I think it best to be silent, surely this difference is not such that you should change 'yours affectionately' into 'yours truly.'

After dealing in detail with all the charges, Pusey passes to a more interesting topic which had been raised in Hook's letter, and often since—the relation of Newman and his friends to the young Rationalistic school which was then growing in Oxford.

Will you listen calmly to one word about Rationalism and Infidelity? I do not say that there has not been some great sin in Roman Catholic countries which has occasioned infidelity in France, Spain, and Italy; and I have been accustomed to appeal to the state of things in France when people were harassed by the much lesser evils among ourselves. But you must not be one-sided. Modern Rationalism is not the growth of Romanism. It had its root in English ground, whether in the hypocrisy of degenerate Puritanism or the licentiousness of the Cavaliers. By God's mercy it was removed from us; but it was translated to France, and in Germany it, far more than 'French frivolity' (although Voltaire had his miserable influence), was the parent of German Rationalism. The decayed Lutheranism and Pietism resisted for a while, but, having no intrinsic life, while resisting fell into its arms. Whatever Rationalism there is at Oxford or Cambridge (and here, I trust, its extent has been much exaggerated) is of German origin. I dreaded it twenty-one years ago. It was repelled for a time, when it showed itself in Dr. Hampden's Lectures, but they who chiefly opposed it were put down, and it has sprung up afresh through pupils of Dr. Arnold's. Its origin is ultra-Protestant in Germany; it was brought here by those who Germanized, Liberals. It existed independently and anterior to any teaching of Newman's (these are simply matter of fact and dates), it shows itself among those, of course, who are opposed to Catholic truth. The 'Fathers' find no more favour at its hands than the Middle Ages; you and I no more than Newman. Of course, it is glad to take hold of the secessions to justify itself; but it hates your teaching just as much as it does mine, and speaks with contempt of both of us, and says that Rome is, at least, clearer and more definite. Forgive me then, but it is not (as matter of fact) true that 'N. and those others were (God forbid) the agents of the Evil One, in bringing Rationalism into Oxford.' It is clearly contrary to dates and facts. Newman, while he was with us, was its most powerful and successful antagonist.

I have tired your patience, my dear friend. You have turned my 'joy into heaviness': there is enough to weigh one down now, and you add to the burden. I was gladdened at the prospect of new churches in

Leeds, and the good of which I know St. Saviour's has been the instrument (although it would only seem mockery to tell you of this now), and you write me a letter enough to break one's heart, but that, notwithstanding my sins, I still trust in God.

And now, in the Name of our Master and only Saviour, Whom we both alike wish to serve, to Whom we are each to render an account, 'judging nothing before the time,' and 'not judging Another's servant,' may I ask you to pray Him, the God of all peace, that if it be to His praise and glory, He would make this to end in peace? Or would you use, if you do not, the prayer for Unity in our Common Prayer-book?

God be with you and bless you always.

Ever your affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

I am quite sure, however it has come about, that this misunderstanding is the work of Satan, and that Ward, Macmullen, and Case are devoted servants of our Church.

It would be too much to say that Hook was satisfied. But a man of his generous nature could not but be touched by Pusey's appeal. 'I am sincerely sorry,' he wrote, 'that I have hurt your feelings, and I pray you to forgive me.' Pusey must not suppose that Hook meant to call *him* a traitor, or to imply that he had acted dishonourably. He thought, however, that appearances were against the clergy of St. Saviour's, and added, 'I have now stirred you up, and shall remain quiet for the present.'

Pusey set himself to find out, if he could, the true state of the case at St. Saviour's. But he found that the matter had passed out of his hands. A long series of complaints against St. Saviour's had been brought before the Bishop of Ripon. Mr. Ward had had an interview with the Bishop, had explained the story about the Lives of the Saints and the use of the Breviary, and had submitted his own tract on the Holy Communion to the Bishop's judgment. The Bishop was taking time to consider his decision with regard to the book, and the continuance of Mr. Macmullen at St. Saviour's.

Pusey then turned to Hook, whom he hoped to persuade to adopt a more tolerant and unsuspicious attitude towards the clergy of St. Saviour's.

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. HOOK.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Christ Church, Nov. 14, 1846.

I thank you for your lucid letter. I will not enter any more into controversy now; it does no good: what we want, by the mercy of God, is peace and charity and humility. Things are, by His mercy, in a better state than they were last year: I hope that the worst is over. But if you would believe me, who have seen more of their minds than you, the one thing which above all the rest has been shaking men's minds, is the embittered temper of men against each other. There must be a secret Presence of His Good Spirit, which keeps the ship together; else it seems that it must go to pieces, so little is there of that pitch with which the Ark was held together, Christian love, of which the Fathers say that the pitch wherewith it is recorded that the Ark was covered within and without is a type.

I am sure that we must bear with one another, and not assume that what one's self sees or thinks to be the teaching of the Church of England must be so clear to others, that they are dishonest if they do not hold it. I believe that if you were to select any one portion in the Church and make it a standard for the whole, so that all who do not agree with it should leave the Church, you would leave it a mere handful. We cannot afford to part with the Evangelicals as a body, nor all who at present deny Baptismal Regeneration. Our sins have brought us into this state of confusion; and we must pray God to pardon them and bring us out of it. I never could use the language, that Low Church [people] ought to leave the Church. If we could but obtain rest, not 'biting or devouring one another,' we might hope, while we each seek God, to meet with one another in Him. But while there is all this bitter railing, and people are 'throwing dust into the air,' they will never understand one another, nor come to the truth. Many in the Church of England think of you just as ill as they do of me. They cannot help it. The Church of England was, in great measure, asleep, and let them learn earnest religion where they could, and so many an earnest mind sucked in truth and error together. We cannot turn round now upon the Evangelicals, when but for the sin of the Church they would (at least the good among them) have learnt from her the full Gospel of Christ. We must have patience with one another and pray God. The Evangelicals think you are not of the Church of England; you that they are not. You think that I go beyond the Church of England and the Fathers, I suppose; I believe that because, as the Church of England directed me, I follow the 'old Catholic Doctors,' I teach and hold the doctrines of the Church of England. Who is to judge between us? If you were to appeal to the Bishops, many of them would condemn yourself. You think I have left my old principles; I aver that I have not. . . . We look at things, prominently, from two different points of view; you have one set of evils chiefly in your eye, I (may be) another. Let us each pray for grace to do what

God gives us to do with a single eye to His glory, and not to judge one another, and (as in the case of Midian) every one turn his sword against his fellow. . . .

I have entire confidence in Ward, as a loyal son of the Church of England; but one must set one's 'face like a flint,' else it would be enough to bewilder any one to be told, 'You do not belong to us'; 'go'; 'it was an honest act in those who went,' &c. You recollect the story of the Dervish, who was persuaded at last that his dog was a sheep, every one telling him so; if it were not for one's love for the English Church, and for strong feelings against some things in the Roman, and for real sympathy in some people, it were almost enough to make one doubt whether one stood on one's head or one's feet. I am sure many who might have been good members of the English Church have been edged overboard so.

God be with you and bless you, my dear friend.

Ever yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

But Hook seems to have regarded Pusey's letter as a 'declaration of open war.' He himself, without claiming to be Pusey's equal in learning, had read the ante-Nicene Fathers, the chief works of St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, and our best English divines. He could not agree with Pusey in thinking that we can go to the old Catholic doctors to *judge* the Church of England.

'The Church of England,' he continues, 'took them for her guide when she reformed herself—here was her principle. Upon her principle we may act, but then we must always act in subjection to what she ruled at the Reformation—i. e. provided in her Formularies. With all deference to you, I think that the Reformers were as likely to know what was really Catholic and primitive as you are; and what, accepting their teaching, Convocation was overruled by Divine Providence to adopt—that I receive as the voice of the Catholic Church.'

After some further observations, he proceeds:—

'And now, my dear Pusey, let us continue to respect and love, but at the same time to understand, one another. I shall continue to oppose the corruption of one Sacrament when the grace of Baptism is denied, and the corruption of the other Sacrament when the doctrine of the Mass is introduced. I shall contend against Romanism in our Church, as well as against Evangelicalism. You may do, and your friends at St. Saviour's, as you think proper. My people will be warned, and that is enough for me. As by my carelessness they have been exposed to danger, I must be doubly diligent on this point. . . .

'I repeat it. Take your stand openly against me at St. Saviour's,

and I shall be the greatest of all possible friends with you all. We can go down and hold conference with the officers in an enemy's army, as was often done in the late war. But I cannot permit light and darkness, sweet and bitter, to be confounded, and whether the light and the sweet be with me or the good folks of St. Saviour's, I must proclaim that the difference between us is on essentials. Ward is *not* loyal to the Church of England. He has himself told me and written to me that to the Church of England he could *not* defer. He is, therefore, to me a heretic.

‘Yours affectionately,

‘W. F. Hook.’

In the postscript to this letter, Hook formally states his complaint against Pusey:—

‘And what do I complain of? I complain of your building a church and getting a foot in my parish to propagate principles which I detest—having come under the plea of assisting me to propagate the principles I uphold: I complain of your having selected one to oppose me and my principles who approached me as a friend, and who now admits that in so doing he did wrong, and that before he undertook to oppose me by causing a division in Leeds, he ought to have reflected that *he* was not the proper person to have been your agent. I have said to him and he has wept—Et tu Brute?’

‘It is really cruel, mere Jesuitism, thus to misrepresent the injured party—the party injured through an excess of charity, as the persecuting party. It is wicked.

‘Now that you declare open war you will find me liberal enough; but while you were stabbing me under the fifth rib with a smile I had a right to speak out. Oh! Pusey, do seek for simplicity of mind—but even here I am charitable: I hope you are deceived.’

There was no doubt at bottom a theological difference between Hook and Pusey. Pusey thought that the appeal of the Church of England at the Reformation to antiquity was to be taken seriously; Hook practically regarded it only as a useful controversial weapon against the Church of Rome. If the Church of England appealed to antiquity, so Pusey argued, she meant antiquity to be studied and followed by her children; Hook maintained that the ideas of the Reformers about antiquity were practically final, and that to differ from them was disloyal to the Church of England. Thus they read the ancients with different eyes: Pusey desired to know exactly what they meant and to follow it; Hook was willing to agree with the

Fathers so far as they were in agreement with the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Pusey had no doubt that on such grave subjects as the Papal claims or the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary, antiquity, honestly cross-questioned, was distinctly favourable to the Anglican position; although there were other subjects, such as prayers for the faithful departed, or the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as to which the English Church does not speak with the clearness of primitive antiquity. Hook thought that Anglican silence involved a prohibition of primitive doctrine. Pusey was convinced that it ought to be interpreted by the appeal of our Reformation to antiquity, and that single divines were at liberty to go beyond English formularies in this direction, so long as they did not contradict any explicit statements.

He therefore could hardly accept Hook's language as to the documents of the Reformation being practically infallible and irreformable. After elaborating his own belief, he continues:—

‘Forgive me, my dear friend: I know, in your love for the Church of England, it pains you if it be not thought perfect; yet others may, with good George Herbert, sigh over that in “the second Reformation which did not reach the first” and yet be true sons of the Church of England.’

He then adds, with reference to matters at Leeds:—

‘You talk about fighting, protesting, Popery, &c. I really do not know what you are fighting about, what you wish to protest against. The Breviary was never used, the English Lives of the Saints was withdrawn; the little book on the Holy Eucharist is before the Bishop. Surely, since the appeal has been made to the Bishop things may be left with him. St. Saviour's is (as you intended by the Act you procured) a distinct cure. You are no more responsible for St. Saviour's than for London. True, it was built because you wished it, and, out of love for you, there rather than elsewhere. Yet, legally, you gave no consent to its being built. It was built under an Act for building Churches, without leave of the Incumbent. You have diminished your income (God be praised Who put it into your mind) and your responsibilities too. You and I, I imagine, have no further responsibility as to St. Saviour's. It is with the Bishop. But I do hope well, and that you will find hereafter, that St. Saviour's has taken from you a heavy weight, 6000 souls, and will not prove a thorn to you.

'It makes my heart bleed to see all this division; when I had hoped that much good would be done both by this and the Church of All Saints, and another, which will be the fruits of St. Saviour's. "O pray for the peace of Jerusalem," and, I speak in deep, real earnest, that God will forgive me those sins, for which what I had hoped to be to His glory, seems to become an occasion of further division.'

Hook had his rejoinder:—

Nov. 18, 1846.

'You tell me I have no more to do with St. Saviour's than with London. Be it so. But if my neighbour has a hornet's nest close to my garden gates, and my children are likely to be stung by them, I must ask him to remove the nest or I send to the constable. And if there be Romanizing at St. Saviour's I shall send to the Right Reverend Constable—come what will.'

After discussing Pusey's statement that St. Saviour's was built under an Act of Parliament, and after pointing out that, had he chosen to do so, he could have built the church himself, Hook proceeds:—

'I must beg to inform you that I am not a Cranmerite—neither can I look upon our Reformation as you do. It seems to me to be the Low Church view. I receive the Formularies as reformed by Convocations of the English Church—the last Reformation being in 1662. I am glad to know that the Reformers in all the Convocations took for their principle the Bible and the Primitive Church. They knew what was best. They acted under Divine guidance, and I wish not to go beyond them. I do *not* think the Church of England perfect, and if a Convocation is called to carry on the Reformation further, I shall probably take my place, if elected as a proctor, on the Reform benches.'

It is not necessary to quote more than the conclusion of Pusey's reply.

[Nov. 19, 1846].

It is not for me to dissuade you from appealing to the Bishop as to St. Saviour's whenever there is real ground for it. But, my dear friend, you must know full well that the major part of what we hear is a lie. '*Fama mendax*' urges Tertullian, when people believed lies about Christians. I never heard a story about myself which I did not know to be more or less a lie. . . . But again, it is very different to tell the Right Reverend Father of a diocese and to warn people against a church. If he on closer inspection pronounces the supposed hornets to be bees, *even if* the honey be not quite of the same colour and taste as yours; yet still if he allows them to get their honey where they will, or to make it, why then you must be quiet, and not

say that the honey is poison. We are forbidden by a wise Canon to preach against neighbours' sermons, without first going to the Bishop. What else is it to warn people either publicly or privately against St. Saviour's? I am sure one cannot be too cautious about what one repeats. What if one should have sown dissension, by repeating unwittingly of a brother what is untrue? . . .

God bless you ever.

Yours very affectionately,

E. B. P.

I wish you could have provided all Leeds with churches without any help from me. If churches are built even out of envy and strife I hope God will overrule it to good.

Hook replied:—

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

Vicarage, Leeds, Nov. 20, 1846.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

As I have no time to waste in special pleading, I shall tell you what I shall do.

Knowing St. Saviour's to be a semi-papal colony, however careful the clergy there may be to keep within the letter of the law, I shall take an early opportunity, and I expect one soon to offer, of speaking of it as I think, and so of disconnecting it in men's minds from Leeds.

I *must* warn persons against having any connexion with the establishment there, because it was through my blindness that the church was permitted to be built; and I am, therefore, in duty bound to prevent the mischief from extending further. The affliction and curse hath befallen me because of my sins—but these sheep, what have they done?

That I shall repudiate St. Saviour's is decided—*how* will depend on circumstances.

Do not write upon this subject any more, for it is useless. When I compare your defence of St. Saviour's with what goes on there, you only make me the more suspicious. You are either incorrectly informed, or you have got into the habit of defending a cause. I am not going to argue with you. If you are, as you say you are, agreed with me in principle, instead of writing, you will set to work to eradicate Romanism at St. Saviour's. If in your attempt to do so you fail, *then* we shall be in the same boat. I do not care for what men *say*: I look to what they *do*. What you have *done* is to send Romanizers here—one of them the friend of some of the late perverts;—if guided or in ignorance, try to prevail upon them to resign. Undo what you have done, or at least attempt it. If you either cannot or will not, do not write any more. All you can say is that you think that they are not Romanizers—and all I can say is that, as I know them to be Romanizers, I shall warn all men of the danger of touching pitch.

As to yourself—you tell me that our principles are the same. I rejoice to hear it, as I, of course, believe mine to be right. . . .

Yours affectionately,

W. F. HOOK.

. . . Bennett writes me word that Dodsworth's three curates are going over to Rome. How long before the clergy of St. Saviour's will follow them?

Pusey was ready to break off the correspondence about St. Saviour's as Hook desired.

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. HOOK.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Christ Church, Nov. 21, 1846.

Once more, do not hastily believe reports. Mr. Bennett's information is inaccurate. One of Dodsworth's curates, Gordon, has left him: the other two have not, and have no intention of doing so. When will there be an end of circulating groundless reports?

I shall not trouble you again, in private, about St. Saviour's. But let me earnestly ask you this. You say 'this affliction and curse' and your previous 'blindness' befell you 'because of your sins.' Then let us humble ourselves and pray God to guide us. I hope to do so, and especially this Advent, and you will pray for me. And you, my dear friend, while you attribute the building of St. Saviour's to your sins, do not seem even to suspect that your vehement excitability, and hard judgements of others and readiness to believe evil of them, can be in part from the same infirmities.

I have no reason to fear lest Ward and his friends should leave us. But your (forgive me) intolerance is enough to disturb any one who is not firmly settled. Do let us humble ourselves, and remember the Judgement Day when we must give account of all our acts and words and want of charity and 'believing evil,' and pray God to 'guide our feet into the way of peace.'

Will you use with me the Seven Penitential Psalms daily and give yourself wholly to God to guide you, not forestall what it ought to be? Anything done against St. Saviour's will shake very many hearts through the kingdom.

Farewell.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

There can be no doubt that Hook was better informed than Pusey as to the drift of Ward's mind. If Hook was too suspicious to be always capable of an equitable judgment, Pusey was too sanguine to be accurate in his estimate of what men, whom he loved and trusted, were

likely to do. The day before Pusey last heard from Hook, he received a letter from Ward, which showed that there was more reason than he had supposed for anxiety as to Ward's position as regards the English Church.

The Bishop meanwhile had decided on the matters submitted to him. He took exception to the particular form in which Ward had stated the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Presence, and he desired Mr. Macmullen to retract the assertion that the Blessed Virgin intercedes,—a retraction for which it surely would be difficult to allege authority either from Scripture or the formularies of the Church of England. Hook, in the meanwhile, made up his mind that the present administration of St. Saviour's must come to an end. On his return from Bishopthorpe, where he had been on a visit, he wrote to Pusey as follows:—

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

Vicarage, Leeds, Dec. 12, 1846.

I call upon you in the name of God most solemnly, to persuade Ward to resign, to withdraw Macmullen and Case, and to give the patronage of St. Saviour's to the Bishop.

This, after serious reflection, I am convinced is the only way in which you can make reparation for the mischief which you have, unintentionally, done to the cause of Christianity in Leeds.

If you refuse to act on this solemn appeal made to you in the name of our God and Saviour, we must labour for Ward's suspension, and the Bishop, having sequestered the living, will I trust place a man there who will do his duty.

You have made me a truly wretched man. What my course ought to be, whether to leave Leeds or not, I do not yet know.

Yours still affectionately, in the hopes that you will take the honest straightforward course I have pointed out.

W. F. HOOK.

Before Pusey's reply could reach Hook an incident had occurred which put an end to any friendly relation between Ward and the Vicar of Leeds. On December 15, Hook delivered a lecture at the Leeds Church Institution on 'The Three Reformations, Lutheran, Roman, Anglican,' by way of making his own position clear in the eyes of his parishioners. A scene which took place at the close

of his lecture is thus described by himself, in a more than usually vehement letter to Pusey.

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

[Dec. 19, 1846.]

Mr. Ward came out of St. Saviour's parish into the parish of Leeds on Tuesday, and after I had read a lecture to my parishioners on the *Via Media*, attacked me with a fierceness which nothing but a doubt of his sanity at the time could justify, exhibiting a specimen of a want of recollectedness and self-control not creditable to your party. But I have forgiven him, and he saw, I hope, his error. He then publicly asserted that in vindicating the *Via Media* I was opposing principles for which the clergy of St. Saviour's were responsible. They have not only, on this ground, shaken the faith of persons unfortunately connected with them, but in spite of the Homilies they proclaim that it is sinful to speak against the Church of Rome. But when I say this, I know that I shall be silenced by special pleading.

But now comes a point on which no special pleading can be available. Mr. Ward deliberately declares, and has written to me stating the fact, that he and the clergy of St. Saviour's were sent to Leeds for the purpose of opposing my principles: that my principles of the *Via Media* are precisely those which they are commissioned to oppose more strongly than the Evangelical. On my remonstrating with him on the impropriety of a person like himself, under many obligations to me, and always having expressed gratitude—taking a situation for the very purpose of opposing me in my own parish—he has been overwhelmed with grief, and says that such is the fact, though he cannot justify it.

Now, dear Pusey, did I deserve this at your hands? I have stood by you when you were, as I thought, misrepresented and persecuted: I have placed my own character in jeopardy as a sound Anglican to defend you. And you repay me by approaching me as a friend, offering to obtain a new church for me—in my parish—while all the while you were organizing a plan to oppose me!! Is this acting like a Christian? Is this (which I had strong grounds to suspect long since, but which is now not only admitted but proclaimed) conduct that can be justified by any but a Jesuit? Do not mistake me—I do not think you are a Jesuit; but I believe you to be under the influence of Jesuits. Your own representatives here say as much; they seem to admit that you were only the puppet while others pulled the strings.

You say that if you cannot carry all your points against the Bishop many will leave the Church of England. This is a thing to be desired. The men at St. Saviour's, if honest men, must leave the Church of England; and I suspect now that they are prohibited from serving Rome through the Church of England, they will do so. Whether you ought to go, I cannot take upon myself to say. . . .

You must not wonder at my not signing myself yours affectionately.

W. F. Hook.

Pusey could but immediately deny, with the most solemn emphasis, any intention of offering the slightest opposition to the great work which Hook was doing at Leeds.

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. HOOK.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Christ Church, Dec. 20, 1846.

I am just returned from the Ordination and Holy Communion. I only write this line to say that what you tell me about Ward's being sent to oppose you, is wholly unintelligible to me. I never dreamt of anything of the kind. The one object for which I selected Ward was as a laborious parish priest; who, I hoped, would lead a self-denying strict life, and practise the Cross he preached. I had not one thought of controversy or of anything but of souls being won to Christ. You will recollect how carefully I avoided any topic of controversy, in preaching myself, at Leeds.

I had not a thought of opposing you, but of carrying on the same work you were doing. There must be some terrible mistake, but wherein it has arisen I know not. You and Ward do not seem able to understand one another. However, *before God, at Whose Altar I have just been*, and Whose Presence I hope I know, I never had even the remotest thought of opposing you in Leeds or anywhere else, either when I asked Ward to accept the charge of St. Saviour's or at any subsequent time, nor, in recommending any whom I did recommend, did I act from any other motive, or had any bye-end in view, except simply to send persons who, I believed, would give themselves wholly to the work of their ministry. To have done as you think I have done, would, of course, have been rank hypocrisy. I would have come to Leeds to explain; only now, my being there would make matters worse.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

P.S. I hold Ward's teaching [in his tract on the Holy Eucharist] as Patristic and not against our Formularies.

On Christmas Eve, Hook wrote once more, and much to the same effect as before.

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

Dec. 24, 1846.

Ward has let my people know that his principles and mine are wide as the poles asunder. This known, when the St. Saviour's people go over to Rome, which I hope they will do soon, persons worthy of consideration will see that it has not been the result of *my* teaching: for the abuse of names I care not a straw, but I am bound to take care that my usefulness here is not interrupted. And so, my good Pusey,

let us forgive and forget, and after this Christmas Eve let us only remember that we have agreed to differ, and that we will love as differing friends.

Yours still affectionately,

W. F. HOOK.

A blessing to you this Christmas. Depend upon it you are mistaken in Macmullen.

On this point Hook was right. If he expressed himself with unguarded vehemence, he took the measure of men more accurately than Pusey. Still, it is probable that at St. Saviour's, Hook, by his vehemence, helped in some degree to precipitate the result which they both deplored¹. Whether the secession could have been ultimately prevented it is useless to inquire: as a matter of fact it was precipitated.

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

Vicarage, Leeds, December 30, 1846.

You are aware by this time that Macmullen and his dupes have gone over to the Mother of Abominations, guilty of the deadly sins of heresy and schism.

Ward and Case remain, I suppose to make more dupes: though strong measures must be taken on my part. I cannot permit a church and establishment to remain in Leeds for the destruction of souls without seeking to abate the nuisance.

I called upon you most solemnly in the Name of the Great God to persuade Ward to resign, and to withdraw your other people. It is now too late to do this entirely, but if you have any sense of honour or of justice you should withdraw Ward and give the presentation to the Bishop.

I must take steps to denounce you and your followers as being in my opinion heretics.

I regard you as such from your last letter. If your view of the Eucharist be not that taken by the Church of England, instead of bending your own spirit to the Church, you must, as you say, leave the Church. . . .

And so farewell. I believe you will be sorry for the incalculable mischief of which you have been the cause: not so your advisers.

W. F. HOOK.

On Jan. 1, 1847, Mr. Macmullen and two laymen from St. Saviour's were admitted into the Church of Rome.

¹ Mr. Macmullen said that he owed his conversion to Rome to Dr. Hook, who had opened his eyes to the real character of the Church of England.

Had it been possible for Pusey to go and help towards quieting minds at St. Saviour's, it would have been, on every account, desirable that he should have done so. But, as matters stood, his presence in Leeds would only have embittered the breach with Hook; and with characteristic unselfishness, Charles Marriott, as one of the trustees of St. Saviour's, placed himself at Pusey's disposal to be sent to Leeds whenever Pusey wished. Marriott seems at once to have appreciated with accuracy how serious the situation was. His singularly calm and penetrating mind was less liable than Pusey's to that disturbance of the judgment which strong affections often involve; and men who were awed into reserve by Pusey's position and character, often showed themselves to Marriott in some light which allowed him to see the real state of the case.

On Jan. 7 he went to Leeds, and on the next day, before seeing Hook, reported to Pusey as follows:—

‘St. Saviour's, Leeds, Jan. 8, 1847.

‘There was more to complain of here than you thought for, through Macmullen's indiscretion (to say the least). And at last, the state of things being what it was, the Bishop was right in strongly pressing his removal. I shall know more before I see you, but I must also say that I am convinced Ward is unequal to his post, and can only be safe here with a man able to *lead* him in a wise and quiet course. I still deprecate his resigning at present, because it would shock so many, and might harm himself.’

That same evening Marriott saw Hook. Hook told him that St. Saviour's was a nursery of Romanism. Ward must resign, and the presentation be placed in the hands of the Bishop. Hook ‘wished to be considered henceforth an opponent not only of Romanism but of Puseyism.’ Marriott's real trouble was to get at the facts. ‘I am most puzzled,’ he wrote to Pusey, ‘by flat contradictions about what Ward has himself said.’ Hook's information was second or third hand; and he was too excited to review it critically. ‘Hook,’ wrote Marriott, ‘is so hasty in conversation that I do not report him to have said what he has not said twice or three times, and under strict questioning.’ When Marriott subjected Ward to what

would appear to have been a severe cross-examination, he could discover in Ward's memory no trace of some of the most irritating things which he was reported to have said. But he also had spoken on the impulse of the moment; and there can be no doubt that his memory was largely at fault.

The result of Marriott's mission to Leeds was that Ward agreed to resign St. Saviour's. It went sorely against Marriott's inclination to advise this course; but he thought that with a 'more patient and less variable man,' the trustees might hope to 'quench calumny by lack of fuel.' Marriott saw the Bishop of Ripon, who was of course much pleased at the resignation. But Mr. Ward's own parishioners were by no means satisfied. It is not often that a year's work can command such an expression of confidence and affection as that whereby 322 communicants of St. Saviour's endeavoured to persuade the Bishop not to accept Mr. Ward's resignation.

'During the whole period,' they plead, 'that Mr. Ward has had the charge of us, we have never heard from him either in public or private any teaching which would induce us to join the Roman communion, or tend in any degree to shake our confidence in our Mother the Church of England; and we beg most respectfully to state our deep conviction, that by the removal of Mr. Ward from ministering among us, whenever it may occur, we shall be deprived of a blessing and a privilege which will not easily be replaced.'

But the Bishop was inexorable. Mr. Ward had 'weakly yielded to sinister influences'; and had 'attempted to establish at St. Saviour's a system foreign to the spirit of our Church.' In such cases it would be unfair to scan too closely the terms in which Bishops announce the decisions at which they have arrived.

Pusey's next letter to Hook is a very generous acknowledgment of his own share in these troubles.

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. HOOK.

Feb. [5], 1847.

I own myself quite mistaken about Macmullen, and that I did much mischief in sending him to Leeds. It will happen to one that one sees one side of a person only, i.e. that he involuntarily shows one

side only. It has been indeed (as I wrote word to the Bishop) a severe warning not to recommend for any important place any one who had been seriously shaken as to the English Church. I believe still that Macmullen did go to Leeds honestly meaning to preach the truth only, but that he and Wilk[inson] mutually unsettled each other. . . .

About Case, my dear friend, I was not mistaken. . . .

I think about Ward you were right so far, that it was of importance that he should have good Anglicans about him, and his mistake in one or two instances was in following the wishes of others instead of ruling them. Macmullen took the lead (as being intellectually a superior person) in a way that he ought not. . . .

One of my greatest sorrows about the past is, that as far as I have contributed to the confusion by recommending Macmullen, it has involved the failure of Ward in a place to which he clings affectionately, and where he might have been eminently useful. . . .

E. B. P.

Hook was again as affectionate as ever. He was perhaps 'making an idol of his parish,' and he 'accepted the punishment' which St. Saviour's had inflicted on him 'with gratitude.' He had good hopes.

REV. DR. HOOK TO E. B. P.

Feb. 6, 1847.

Let the past be buried in oblivion. Let us all be more prudent for the future. . . . The chief damage done to me is one in which you cannot sympathize. I have lost the confidence of the good old Church and King men, who used to support me because they thought me a supporter of our constitution in Church and State. They have fought my battles; they have felt disgraced by the late proceedings; and henceforth they will adhere to the Evangelicals. . . . It has been by the support of these men that I have advanced, and of late years it has been chiefly from them that I have made converts to godliness. May God bless you, my dear friend.

It might have been hoped that peace was fully re-established between Pusey and Hook. But further correspondence having been necessitated by complications, in part the result of the secessions at St. Saviour's, Hook's excitable spirit could not refrain from replying in the following terms:—'I deserve,' he wrote to Pusey, 'the worst suspicions; and no one can be blamed for suspecting me to be a Romanizer and a Jesuit because I allowed myself to appear as a friend of yours.' After a letter of singular

vehemence he ended by declining all further private correspondence¹. Pusey of course could not answer this letter. But within three weeks Hook himself re-opened private correspondence with Pusey, to claim £212—the balance of the collection at the Consecration of St. Saviour's, of which he said Ward had 'defrauded' the church by placing it in Pusey's hands, while he himself, as Vicar of Leeds, ought to have had control of it. In order to recover this sum he threatened proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts immediately after Easter. Hook added:—

March 15, 1847.

Since I wrote last things have taken a turn here. All my people have rallied round me; the Bishop is quietly putting down the Evangelicals, and we shall all be prepared to make our stand against any one whom you and Ward may send to head what you must pardon me for calling the faction which was formed at St. Saviour's.

Yours truly,
W. F. Hook.

As to the £212 Pusey's explanation was complete. Before the service at the Consecration, Hook had given up his legal claim on the collection to Ward. The £212 had been placed in the offertory, on behalf of another person, by Pusey himself; and the money, with the Bishop of Ripon's consent, was being retained for a chapel in St. Saviour's parish. Pusey added characteristically:—

'If you, notwithstanding your consent on the faith of which I put in the £212, claim it and the Bishop approves, I will pay you £212 out of my own income, involved as I am. £212 is not a sum to quarrel about, much less after so many years.'

For the rest, Pusey was

'very thankful to hear of the turn things had taken, or rather which I hope God has given them. I was deeply pained at the persecution which Jackson told me you were undergoing.'

Hook dropped his vehemence without changing his tone of suspicion and defiance. He was satisfied on being assured that the money would go to build a church in

¹ In this letter Hook falls back from 'Yours affectionately,' to 'Yours faithfully.'

Leeds. He frankly told Pusey, however, that he must view with distrust any one whom Pusey might appoint to the incumbency of St. Saviour's. A burnt child, he said, dreads the fire.

The condition of things at St. Saviour's in February, 1847, is thus described by Pusey to Keble :—

‘Feb. 3, 1847.

‘St. Saviour's is a complete wreck. The daily service given up, and [the services] only precariously supplied on Sunday by a clergyman of another church, who must be soon worn out, if this goes on. Now the sick are not visited; the children not taught; no one can take charge of them.’

Keble had suggested several names. He advised Pusey to apply to some one whose name would not be associated with their own; ‘some Cambridge man, or some one from St. Columba's.’ He added, ‘I almost think I would rather let Hook and the Bishop nominate, than incur any serious chance of another outbreak.’ All the persons of whom Pusey had at first thought had failed him: Mr. George Williams, of King's College, Cambridge; Mr. J. H. Pollen, of Merton College, Oxford; Mr. Hickley, of Trinity College, Oxford; and others.

Pusey then fell back on one of whom he had thought at first, the Rev. A. P. Forbes, of Brasenose College, Oxford. Pusey had heard that Mr. Forbes was to be offered some work at St. Augustine's, Canterbury. On finding that this was not the case, he offered St. Saviour's to Mr. Forbes, who began his work there on Trinity Sunday, May 31, 1847. But the new Vicar did not remain long enough at Leeds to justify Pusey's choice. He soon entered on that distinguished career which will be remembered as that of the man who in piety and learning stands first among the modern Bishops of the Church of Scotland.

St. Saviour's brought Pusey into trouble with many other persons besides Hook. He asked the Bishop of Ripon to allow Mr. Case to remain at St. Saviour's; and was met by a peremptory refusal, accompanied by a stern reference to ‘the danger of the course which’ Pusey ‘had

been long pursuing.' He begged Archdeacon Churton to pray with him that the appointment of a successor to Mr. Ward may be to the glory of God, and to the saving of men's souls, and to tell him if he knew of any simple self-denying (unmarried) priest who would labour to gather in his Master's lost sheep, and preach energetically from the heart to the heart, without technicality or undue love of ceremonial. 'I am very anxious,' Pusey added, 'that Ward's successor should be one in whom the Bishop could place confidence.' Archdeacon Churton's reply must have shown Pusey how isolated he was at this moment. 'I will be no party,' he wrote, 'not even by a prayer, to an appointment which is to be made, as it now seems, in contrariety to Hook's wishes. I will therefore only pray that you may be directed to see clearly what the present exigency does really require.' In a second letter Archdeacon Churton makes an earnest appeal to Pusey to turn the tables on his calumniators, and right himself in the eyes of all true Anglicans, by resigning the patronage, either altogether or for this turn to the Bishop.' But Pusey could not do this. He was pledged to the plan of a college of priests at St. Saviour's; and although the Bishop would allow him to attempt this on his own responsibility, Pusey had good reason to think that the Bishop would not himself appoint a man who would be favourable to it. Indeed he had been told that the Bishop 'thought daily service a loss of time in a large parish': what then would become of the fuller devotional life which it was desirable that an associated body of clergy should lead?

Pusey also asked Archdeacon Manning to suggest a new incumbent 'who could, ever so slowly, build up St. Saviour's after this hurricane from the desert which has swept all away.' Pusey added, 'It is heartbreaking, but one must not choose one's own chastisements.' Manning was ready to try to find a man for the vacant post. But his reflections on the import of what had happened could not but add to Pusey's distress.

ARCHDEACON MANNING TO E. B. P.

Jan. 23, 1847.

As to the Leeds event I have felt very truly to share in your disappointment and distress—(yet, my dear friend, is heartbreaking a word of the Church?—I know you only used it esoterically to me)—and, indeed, I regard it as a real disaster to us all. I almost fear to say what my thoughts are about it lest I should seem to censure, or should renew your pain. It appears to me to bring out many sad facts, such as the real disunion among those who were united—I mean Hook, and your friends—the real change of Hook's tone—and the impossibility of uniting with him on the basis he had laid down in his late lecture, &c. All this reinforces those who desire to depose both him and others from all public respect. And I cannot but feel that such events happening one by one at the Altars which have stood as chief signs to be spoken against, do reasonably throw upon the whole body of men we most hold with a public imputation of uncertainty, and secret unsteadiness. I cannot wonder that great and extensive mistrust has grown up.

You know how long I have to you openly expressed my conviction that a false position has been taken up in the Church of England. The direct and certain tendency, I believe, of what remains of the original Movement is to the Roman Church. You know the minds of men about us better than I do, and will therefore know both how strong an impression the claims of Rome have made on them; and how feeble and fragmentary are the reasons on which they have made a sudden stand or halt in the line on which they have been, perhaps insensibly, moving for years.

It is also clear that they are 'revising the Reformation': that the doctrine, ritual, and practice of the Church of England, taken at its best, does not suffice them: that the theology of Andrewes, Thorndike, Overall, and Bp. Forbes is too strait for them. All this proves to me that the waters have overpassed the bounds of the Church of England taken at any time since Henry VIII. Of course all this would be found variously and in various measures in various minds—no three exactly agreeing together—which is a chief danger.

I say all this not in faultfinding but in sorrow. How to help to heal it I do not pretend to say.

One thing, I trust, will be done. I mean, that no men may be sent to St. Saviour's as to the *Infirmery*. It is a work too great and good to be risked for the sake of any individual minds.

I fear this letter will add heavy thoughts to you, but how can we be free from them?

May all peace and strength be with you—my dear friend.

Ever yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

As was suggested at the commencement of this chapter, the troubles at St. Saviour's were typical of the difficulties that beset the Church Revival at this moment. It had stirred forces the right guidance of which was a task of no slight difficulty. Some of the young, ardent, unbalanced minds which were influenced by it were in continual danger of following Newman's example. Older and abler adherents, like Manning and Churton, were watching anxiously, but with widely different feelings, to see what would be the final outcome of the Movement. The Bishop of Ripon and Dr. Hook, being themselves in authority, could not but be influenced by the vast mass of excited and suspicious Puritanism with which they had to deal; and, not entirely at one with Pusey on theological principles, they failed to distinguish his present attitude from the general Romanizing position. Pusey, meanwhile, was endeavouring, with his usual patience and loyalty, to vindicate the Catholic traditions of the English Church, about which he had himself never seriously hesitated.

It is satisfactory to reflect that, after the troubles and losses of the next few years, the principles which Pusey maintained had vindicated their claim within the English Church; and Archbishop Longley, Dean Hook, and Dr. Pusey were found working side by side in strengthening and building up the Church to which they were all alike devoted.

CHAPTER VI.

PUSEY'S ISOLATION — HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ROME
MISUNDERSTOOD—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. GLAD-
STONE — PROJECT OF A COMMENTARY ON HOLY
SCRIPTURE — LAST PHASE OF THE HAMPDEN CON-
TROVERSY.

1847-1848.

AT no time in his life was Pusey so largely cut off from human sympathy as during the ten years which followed Newman's secession. During this time he was an object of widespread, deep, fierce suspicion. Some Heads of Houses would not speak to him when they met him in the street. The post brought him, day by day, from all parts of the country, various forms of insults, by letters signed and anonymous, reflecting on his honesty or his intelligence, as might suit best the writer's fancy. The circle of his old friends—even of those who had not followed Newman—was seriously diminished. Anglicans like Churton, Sewell, and W. Palmer, were more distant than in former years, even if they did not express disapproval after the fashion of Hook. Not a few of the younger and more brilliant minds, shocked by Newman's secession, yet unprepared to follow him, were already drifting away, under the stress of an unbalanced logic, towards this or that form of infidelity. His intercourse with junior members of the University was more restricted than in former years; acquaintance with him was regarded by the governing authorities in the University as a reason for viewing those who enjoyed it with suspicion, or as at heart

possible converts to the Church of Rome. If Pusey was visited by Oxford friends, it was more or less by stealth; if acquaintance with him was avowed, it was, at least in some circles, in a deprecatory and apologetic tone. He was, in the words of a vigorous writer at the time, widely regarded as 'tainted'; he 'wandered about as an ecclesiastical Cain, with the Vice-Chancellor's mark on his forehead, and an Exeter Hall anathema on his head.'

When, in the Christmas Vacation of 1846, he visited Clifton to be with his only surviving daughter, he was invited to preach in Clifton parish church on Christmas Day. Thereupon two or three of the local Puritans intimated their intention of walking out of the church 'with marked and significant stampings, the moment he mounted the pulpit.' Such 'a ravening wolf from the banks of the Isis'—again to quote the vivid language of the local writer—could not be allowed to devour these lambs at his good pleasure. Nevertheless he was asked to preach by the Rev. H. Richards at Horfield Church on the following Sunday. One who was present describes the scene.

'The incumbent and curate were officiating; in a pew under the pulpit in a plain black gown sat the man whose name is known throughout the kingdom—arraigned on the platform of our great cities, and pronounced with something like a supernatural sense of dread by the smallest coteries of the remotest village—one of no high or haughty bearing however, with authority in his eye, or commanding intellect enthroned on his brow, but drooping his head meekly on his breast, he seemed rather to shrink from than challenge observation. Of all the simple people that crowded that simple church not one looked more humble or more unconscious of self, or of the stealthy or fixed glances which were directed to him from time to time by the stray comers, some of whom, I have little doubt, expected to see the celebrated Pusey (an heresiarch in the eyes at least of half the Church) of some fearful outline, differing from other men in his form and visage: no horn or cloven hoof, however, protruded to reward their curiosity¹.'

The eye-witness proceeds—and it must be remembered that he writes 'in all the fervour of his Protestantism':—

¹ Quoted from the *Bristol Times*, in the *Guardian* of Feb. 3, 1847.

‘While the last Psalm was being sung, the Professor left his pew (no officious sexton leading the way), and ascended to the pulpit, on the floor of which he knelt down in private prayer, his upraised hands and grizzled thin hair being the only parts visible, until the singing had concluded, when he rose and prayed in a contrite and almost thrilling tone. Yet was there nothing affected in all this; on the contrary, whatever Dr. Pusey’s opinions or doctrines may be, so far as man can judge of man, you would have said his character was that of pious humility and self-abasement.

‘His text was taken from part of the sixth verse of the twenty-first chapter of Revelation. “And He said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End.” Never before did I hear so beautifully evangelical a sermon as this from the man who has given a name to a party which is supposed to represent a different principle in the Church. It had but one fault, it was fifteen minutes too long. Nevertheless, it was listened to throughout by that little crowded church-full with fixed and rapt attention, though it was neither declamatory, noisy, nor eccentric; but plaintive, solemn, and subdued, breathing throughout, I may say, a beauty of holiness and a Christian spirit so broad and catholic, so deep and devotional, that while the most zealous Protestant could find nothing in it he might not approve, the most bigoted Roman Catholic could not enter an exception to a single expression that it contained. I never recollect so feelingly apposite a sermon for the close of the year, the very last week of which was then lapsing beneath our feet—we seemed, as it were, to look back with him from an eminence, in serious review upon the transactions of the year, ere it had yet passed from our sight, while ever and anon, in touching recurrence and solemn effect, came the words, “It is done,” which were every time, with some beautiful feature of novelty, illustrated and enlarged upon. He seemed, however, to love to dwell upon the sad and melancholy; and his voice, though clear and distinct, had something mournful, and at times almost wailing, about it. The subject and the season, indeed, would seem to invite such a feeling, and at moments you could almost fancy you were hearing some office for the departing year, at the close of which, as if in mournful cadence, came the word (for in the language in which it is written it is but one word) “It is done.” There he stood, a plain, and to all appearance, an humble and lowly man, preaching to a simple people, and speaking with the melancholy meekness as of one stricken and tried, yet uncomplaining. The very gloom of the little church (for the four candles by which he had to read his sermon, and which were hardly sufficient to cast a faint reflection on the fixed countenances of the attentive listeners, were all the light which parochial economy could afford) seemed in keeping; yet this plain and apparently unpretending man, of mild manners and of middle years and stature, who now preached a sermon more perfectly free from controversy than ever I before heard, had himself

been foremost in the greatest controversy of the age, so as to attract the eyes of the kingdom to his collegiate retirement.

“Who be that that preached?” said one young rustic maiden to another as we left the church; “a monstrous nice man, but dreadful long.”

“Don’t you know?” replied the other; “it is that Mr. Pewdsey, who is such a friend to the Pope; but come along, or we’ll be late for tea”; and away they trotted.’

The writer’s own reflections are worth quoting as showing how much was felt at this date to depend upon Pusey’s steadfastness, and how difficult it was for those who did not know him as yet, to be sure that he would be true to the Church of England to the end:—

‘Like some lone column, the only one of a stately row which once adorned the portico of some great academy, but which in melancholy series, one by one, have sunk, undermined, or fallen prostrate, he still stands, though alone. There is a solemn, but sad sense of solitude in the feeling with which you contemplate him; while at the same time there is in his very isolation something of insecurity, as though you feared the fate which levelled all the rest awaited him also, and you expected daily to hear that he too had disappeared. Yet, notwithstanding predictions and apprehensions, he still stands: the slender shaft has not snapped under the weight of academic censure and public obloquy that has been heaped upon it; but

“By the billow-beaten side
Of the foam-besilvered main,
Darkling and alone he stands.”

And if in some years more he still remain stationary and stable, still be found occupying his place within the pale of the Anglican Church, I shall regard him with as much triumph and satisfaction as I now watch him with anxiety; for if he abide with us, he will have established his character for fixed and founded principle, under an ordeal severe and trying. Those who call themselves his opponents in the Church taunt him with duplicity in remaining—they impatiently and petulantly demand the reason of his stay, and inquire why he tarries, after his old associates have passed the line; while his “old associates” themselves beckon to him with dim fingers from Rome to follow—voices long familiar to him and long loved, I have no doubt, with which he held deep and lofty converse in the shadowy cloisters of Oxford—voices which, even in their fall, must still have fond and affectionate associations for him—these call to him, too, from their delusive retreats at Oscot, “to come over,” nor loiter behind his personal and intellectual friends and literary colleagues. These are things and temptations to try a man’s principles and solidity:

those who are in, wishing to thrust him out, impugning his sincerity and taxing his patience; and those who are out, appealing to old feelings and old friendships to induce him to follow—tests, light, it is true, to fixed and rooted conviction, but full of peril to Edward Bouverie Pusey, if his principles are as infirm as by some they are represented to be.’

Pusey might have lessened the suspicion with which he was regarded, if he would have consented publicly to join in those vague popular declamations against the Church of Rome which are the stock-in-trade of Protestant oratory. He did indeed reject, with the deliberation warranted by solid learning, the ‘modern parts’—as he called them—of the Roman system, and especially those claims to an exclusive Catholicity which involved a denial of Christ’s presence and grace in the Church of England¹. This he was saying in private every day of his life, by letter or by word of mouth, to those who sought his advice; but undoubtedly, now as always, he preferred to vindicate the claims of the Church of England by asserting her intrinsic merits, rather than by proclaiming and denouncing the errors of the Church of Rome.

Thus we find him writing to the Rev. W. J. Copeland, who found his position at Littlemore full of trials, arising from its associations, and the importunities to which he was exposed at the hands of his old friends:—

E. B. P. TO REV. W. J. COPELAND.

Hayling I. [Aug. 1847.]

You have been so accustomed to heartaches these many years, so much more than any of us, daily and hourly, that you can understand how the thought of your giving up duty goes through one. Yet you can think it possible that your having been continually with our friends at Littlemore, watched all their movements, seen them gradually losing their hold and letting go, may have insensibly biassed your view of things, not as matter of judgment, but as matter of impression and feeling. It could not be otherwise. It is almost a marvel to me that it has not done so more. It is one of those instances of the great hold which the Church of England really

¹ He fully accepted Keble’s words, written at this time to the Rev. W. U. Richards: ‘I am more and more and more surprised how any one professing

deference for Antiquity should think it necessary to accept the exclusive Roman views.’

has over those formed in her, and by God's good Spirit in her; and I am persuaded she would not have this power, unless it were given her from above. But every one almost must have felt more or less the influence of merely having doubts continually brought across the mind; it is like living in an unhealthy atmosphere; one breathes, inhales it, insensibly. I suppose I myself shook some people, as being unloyal to the Church of England, although I do believe her to be a great instrument in God's hands, and that His Holy Spirit is lodged in her. . . .

I do wish you would put down all your difficulties about the Articles in detail and show them to J. K[eble]. Until we do this, we increase our difficulties often, letting them multiply into one another, and each bear the force of all the rest, instead of being single items. There must be some way of signing the Articles rightly, since J. K., who has so much more of God's Holy Spirit, and so much more insight and tenderness, has no difficulty. I am satisfied they are anything but 'a condemnation of the generation of God's children,' and only condemn what is really wrong. I cannot think of your giving up without being appalled. I know I am not worthy to counsel you about anything, except to go to the father of this Movement, and of each, J. K., and to do what he advises. . . .

God comfort and guide you.

Your very affectionate

E. B. P.

Pusey's confidence in the Church of England, and the exact form of his mental attitude towards the Roman Church at this period, appear very clearly in the subjoined letter:—

MY DEAR —

Your letter and sorrows have been much on my mind, although I could not write as I would.

I wish you could be employed in some way which would lead you to the Fathers. They have been these many years the same comfort to me, as modern Roman writers have been a discomfort to you. And on the same ground, I cannot think that while the children own their fathers, the fathers would disown their children. I read them, learn of them, live among them, as a child; adopt their words, say what they say, do not say what they do not. I live in them as my home. I have not gone about proving to myself our identity with them. I feel it. Theirs is my native language: they are familiar accents. But it does impress upon me that the English appeal to Antiquity is something real and substantial. I could preach volumes of St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine without rebuke. I do not think a Roman Catholic could. If I should have a difficulty here and there, from a conjecture as to some intermediate purification, or some invocation of a saint (and they

are very rare), a R. C. who should preach such courses of sermons, with no mention of St. Mary or of the Saints (for on St. Mary there is entire silence, and Martyrs are mentioned only some few times on their Festivals with regard to miraculous cures by praying at their tombs), would be considered lax or heterodox. I think I have understood that Ave Maria, [or] some commendation to her, is introduced into *every* Roman sermon. We have translated straight through, two thick volumes of St. Augustine: all his sermons on the New Testament. There was not a word to explain—nothing which one might not, as far as doctrine is concerned, preach in our English pulpits. I hear they are preached, changing the style a little. Now conceive a Roman Catholic preaching 133 sermons without any allusion to any one characteristic doctrine of the modern system! Should we not be soon at one, if this could be? And not this only, but St. Augustine's thick folio volume on the Psalms, and half a one on St. John, one might preach through (except for the difference of the Bible, which is neither theirs nor ours). How would not a R. C. be suspected, if he did so! R. C.s sometimes appeal to Antiquity, and say, 'If St. Augustine were to rise and come among us, which would he choose?' I cannot but think he would blame both, and bid us be at one in the faith which he taught, the faith once for all delivered to the Saints. But I cannot think that while we cherish him, he would side against us, or take part with them, who could not teach only what alone was taught in his day. And so my own hopes have been that, as we became more penetrated with the spirit of the Fathers, we should meet backward in the parents of both. Can you imagine St. Augustine writing 'Ad majorem Dei [et] sanctae Mariae gloriam'—when there is not anything special about St. Mary in all his writings? Do you not think such a juxtaposition would startle him? I know how it is defended: still it is a fact, that these things are pressed forward now, and were unknown then. The current tone of devotion which is now made the popular mode of influencing minds is quite different from that which the Fathers would foster, and turns upon another subject. One who wishes us to be gained over to them, suggests a prayer to the Blessed Virgin (just the same prayer as I should use to the Holy Trinity), or says the Rosary of the Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin for this [object]; several others send medals of the B. V. as Dispensatrix of all graces, to be worn by people: (I think, as an act of the will, it might produce its effect.) This is very different from St. Augustine; and until they come to us with St. Augustine's language and doctrine, I think they must not assume that St. Augustine would condemn us because we do not receive what he did not teach.

Yet neither did we think, I think, that those holy men of more modern times, from whose books we have learnt, would condemn us *now*, I mean where they now are. In the flesh, there may surely be 'invincible ignorance' on the one side as well as the other; i. e. the ignorance of long prejudice, accustomed to view the other from one side only, and

not really understanding it. Most R. C.s are accustomed to nothing but foreign Protestants, a class whose fate and history shows them to be really essentially different from us. Say what people will on one side and the other, bodies which have lapsed almost wholly into Arianism in France, Socinianism in Switzerland, Rationalism in Germany, are not akin to us. Nor are the fragments of life among them. That¹ sympathizes with Dissent, not with the Church of England. One need not use many words on this : one may assume it. What marvel then that R. C.s, accustomed to foreign Protestantism, condemn us. But, besides, if they condemn us, it is mostly not upon our doctrine, which they do not know, but on the bare fact of our separation from themselves, and our non-submission to the Roman see. But clearly, as to the right of this, early Antiquity is with us.

Besides, they condemn us (if they do so) *unheard*. If things had gone on as they did before [W. G.] Ward (as Copeland says), like Phaeton with the chariot of the sun, took the reins out of his father's hands, and threw all things into confusion, England would soon have been Catholicized (I do not mean Romanized in Ward's language). The same great work is going on now, and a far deeper work than in more prosperous days, and far wider. It must have its fruits. The seasons are in God's hands. But when the harvest ripens, Rome must own us as a Church ; and God, we may trust, will make us healthfully one.

But some of Pusey's best friends were anxious that, because of the distrust occasioned by secessions at St. Saviour's, Leeds, he should set himself right with general opinion by some explicit and public statement against the Church of Rome. This Mr. Gladstone had urged, and Pusey replied as follows :—

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

Christ Church, Sexag. S. [Feb. 8], 1847.

MY DEAR GLADSTONE,

Richards has read me part of a letter of yours, in which, speaking more kindly of me than I deserve, I am sure, you express a doubt as to my present line of public neutrality as to the Church of Rome.

It would take long to say how I came to this, partly through one I love as a father (not J. H. N.) ; partly through finding the contrary irritate those to whom alone it could be of any use ; partly because I must accompany it, probably, with qualifications still more unacceptable to those who blame or suspect my silence ; partly because I think we have enough to do at home ; partly because I think it engenders a bad spirit ; and then, personally, because I had no call for it.

And now my position is wholly changed. Time was when we were allowed to act upon² the Church ; Bishops, even if they chiefly censured

¹ i. e. foreign Protestantism.

² i. e. influence.

us and us alone, still let us go on, and said something of the good done. Now (I do not blame them) they are all against us. When I was condemned for my sermon, not one spoke for me. The Bishop of Exeter half retracted the value of his permission to preach. I can preach in two pulpits in London, and here and there in a village. I could not, even before these troubles, preach at St. Saviour's, although the instrument of building it. All confidence in me is gone. I do not mean that it has not been my own doing; still it is gone, except among some who love me, and shaken among some of these.

Everything seems then to withdraw me from attempting to do anything for the Church—I mean to act upon her—as a whole. I feel myself a suspected person go to no meetings, take part in no Societies (though I continue to subscribe). I should only make a thing suspected by taking part in it.

On the other hand, even before this break-up, God had begun to give me a more individual work, and a large parish, as it were, in the cure of souls who came to me. This showed me part of a great inner work which He has been and is carrying on more deeply now in human souls, than when things were most prosperous. This seems now the work He gives me to do, when He has withdrawn the other. I hope to have done with controversy of all sorts, within the Church of England or without. My sermons on Absolution were not meant to be an exception to this; but to supply a great practical want. I have been in controversy great part of my theological life; now I may, if God permit, 'go down to my grave in peace.'

I do not wish to give up any duty which God gives me; and, of course, what I publish (if God enable me) must act, more or less, upon the Church, by acting (if He permits it) on individual souls in it.

It was an unusual thing that He gave to presbyters any such office, as seemed to come upon us, unencouraged by Bishops, to fight the battle against heresy, and recall people to forgotten truth. Dear N[ewman] felt this more than I. On looking back to his first Tract, his rallying-cry was 'Our fathers, the Bishops'; when they cast him aside, he felt that his work was done.

I was never under a Bishop, although I wished to think so, and so felt and feel it less. Indeed, I am not depressed, even while I write this. I have full faith in the English Church, even while this storm is on her, and it seems as though she must be let drive, because no one can or will guide her. Yet 'wind and storm fulfil His word,' and will carry her whither He will, and those in her to the haven where they would be—Himself.

In my individual relation to any one, i.e. if any one consults me, I do not omit to speak strongly on the modern part of the Roman system, as a ground for staying where they are. My little books are a tacit protest against it, in that they omit it.

However, I do not mean that there are not all sorts of faults on my part, and that I have not added much to the confusion. I felt, too, that

in trying to keep others in our Communion, I was throwing away any remaining confidence in [me]. I did it deliberately, and do not complain. I am only accounting to you for the line which I, henceforth, hope to keep, unless Bishops should be given us who place any confidence in me : I mean, not to engage in controversy or to interfere in anything which concerns the Church, unless it comes individually to me to do.

You did not wish for this explanation ; but I thought it due to you, having shown your love for me as to St. Saviour's, and you may show it to any friends whom you do not think it will tend to depress.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

If I did say anything publicly about the Church of Rome, it would be that no good can come of this general declamation against it, without owning what is good and great in it. Many feel this, who love the Church of England deeply. Words like the Bishop of R[ipon]'s 'had been moved away from the hope of that Gospel' seem to them simply shocking. Our protest can, I think, be only healthful, effective, if we allow what we ought and what, if people acquainted themselves with the good side of the Roman system, they would. If ever, as a Church, we should put forth all we can admit as true, we might be listened to as to what we except against. But this vague declamation is sorely against 'Caritas.'

So you see I am not a physician for these days ; and my medicine is stronger than people would take, so I had best keep it to myself.

Pusey, although constantly forced into a leading position, was genuine in underrating his influence and the effects of his silence. His desire for the present was to work quietly at the projected Commentary and with individuals, and let other men talk. Thus he writes :—

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

Christ Church, 4th S. after Easter [May 2], 1847.

... If you have any opinion as to anything I could do or undo for the Church, I should be glad to know it. My own bias is to be still. I seem to have an *εργον* before me, if it please God, in the Commentary, and I am disposed to work on in that, influencing the Church indirectly, as He may give me to do, but not attempting anything directly. I have no call. ...

Ever yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

Mr. Gladstone perhaps, from his circumstances, saw more clearly than did Pusey himself how easily his silence, at such a time, might be misconstrued. He had great

doubts whether the world at large understood the strength of disapproval with which Pusey regarded both the secessions and the formation of the desire to secede. The tone of Pusey's letters in the end of 1845 might, he thought, have given the impression that Pusey did not take any very strong view of the positive evils and dangers to which, independently of the act of desertion, persons joining the Roman Church expose themselves.

Pusey's real difficulty in acting as Mr. Gladstone desired at this juncture lay in his relations with other minds that were being drawn more or less powerfully in a Roman direction. He could not allay the suspicions of one set of friends without forfeiting the sympathies of another set, whose loyalty to the Church of England seemed for the moment largely bound up with their confidence in his power of entering into their troubles and difficulties. He had present to his mind the Divine maxim about breaking the bruised reed and quenching the smoking flax. On the whole he preferred to endure the general and deepening suspicion. Everything, he used to say, will be set right at the Day of Judgment.

Pusey's difficulties arising out of the secessions to Rome may be illustrated by the case of the Rev. E. G. K. Browne, Curate of Bawdsey, who had become a Roman Catholic at the end of the year 1845. In August, 1847, Mr. Browne travelled accidentally with a Low-Church Irish clergyman, who describes his experience in a letter to the *Standard*:—

‘On entering a diligence in the town of Caen, in Normandy, a few evenings ago, I made the usual apologies for disturbing the passengers already seated, when the imperfection of my French (I suppose) drew from a gentleman seated opposite, the inquiry concerning myself and a companion, “English, I presume, gentlemen?” On our replying in the affirmative, quick was the rejoinder, “So am I.” And not long after the avowal, “I was lately a clergyman of the Anglican Church: I am now a Catholic, and hope soon to be admitted into the Order of Jesuits.”

‘The speaker was a young man of very spare habit, quick, lively eye, but so exceedingly boyish in appearance, that I was induced to ask, “Do I understand you rightly that you had taken Orders in the Church of England?” to which the reply was “Yes; I was the

Rev. George Browne for eighteen months, but I am now a layman again. I left the Church of England by the express advice of Dr. Pusey, whose last words to me were, 'Mr. Browne, you had better go to Rome, and God go with you'."

This sensational statement was met by a direct contradiction.

'It seems best to say,' wrote Pusey, 'once for all, that if any person ever said anything of the sort he was guilty of wilful untruth. I never advised *any individual whatever* to go to Rome or to leave the English Church. Such advice mostly comes from a very different quarter.'

Meanwhile, before reading Dr. Pusey's letter, Mr. Browne corrected the Irish clergyman's account of his own report of Dr. Pusey's advice.

'I never used the words he [the Irish clergyman] attributes to me, but said that the worthy and excellent Dr. Pusey advised me to the following effect. "If, Mr. Browne, you cannot bring your mind to believe in the Apostolic Succession of the Anglican Church, go to Rome, and God go with you. But if, on the contrary, you are convinced, after diligent study, that we possess the Apostolic Succession, then remain where you are."'

But if the Irish clergyman's memory had done an injustice to Mr. Browne, Mr. Browne had done, however unwittingly, a greater injustice to Dr. Pusey. Pusey's last statement is sufficiently explicit:—

E. B. P. TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'MORNING HERALD.'

SIR,

I see in a letter of Mr. Browne, republished by the *Guardian*, that he says that I did not advise him to 'go to Rome,' but, hypothetically, to the effect that, if he were not convinced that we had the Apostolic Succession, he should go to Rome; if he were convinced that we had it, he should stay. I certainly never turned a young man adrift in this way, to find out for himself that we have the Apostolic Succession. Whatever of this sort I said, was said, after having impressed upon him, at some length, the fact that we have the Apostolic Succession unquestionably. It was said in order to cut off all thoughts of leaving the English Church. My argument was, 'It is a matter of absolute certainty that we have the Apostolic Succession. This is a fact which can be proved in a narrow compass. Since, then, the Church of England has this, and also the true faith "once for all delivered to the saints," there is nothing to impair her authority over

us, and we, in her, have the Sacraments and whatsoever else we need to be saved.' It is sometimes of use to narrow the grounds of controversy; and it is to me a mystery how persons who are persuaded and know that we have the Sacraments and the Presence of Christ among us, can go elsewhere to seek Him Whom we have.

Pusey sought refuge from these heartaches in a scheme of which he was not the author, but of which he lived to complete the only part that was ever completed. The idea of a Commentary on the whole Bible, written with all the aids afforded by modern scholarship, but in accordance with Primitive and Catholic faith, had originated, it would appear, with the Rev. G. Forbes, of Burntisland in Scotland. He mentioned something of the kind to Marriott, who suggested to Pusey that the editors of the Library of the Fathers would be the best editors of the Commentary. The proposal was particularly welcome to Pusey, not only as belonging to what he used to call his 'own subject,' but also because he maintained that Scripture interpreted in such a manner as to exhibit not only the barren philological or historical import of the text, but the deeper truths beneath which constitute its 'mind' and justify us in describing it as inspired, would be the most powerful of all possible reinforcements of Church principles. 'People talk of Tractarianism,' he would say; 'but, after all, the most Tractarian book I ever open is the Bible.'

Pusey described his project as 'a Commentary for the unlearned.' Instead of making a display of acquaintance with modern criticism, it would give only those results of criticism which appeared to be well established, while taking no account of the process by which they had been reached. It would take as its basis the Authorized Version, 'wrought as that is into the very substance of devotional minds amongst us': but additional meanings, latent in the original, although perhaps inevitably unexpressed in the Authorized Version, and in some few cases, other renderings, would be suggested. The language of the Fathers would be embodied in the Commentary; when there were different Patristic explanations, the commentator would select the

most authoritative or probable, and ignore the others. The exposition

‘should be confined to one or two spiritual interpretations (where these are called for) relating to Christ and His Body the Church, or the soul of each individual member of Christ’s mystical body, rather than give manifold spiritual meanings. For these, although all contained in the depths of Holy Scripture (as the prismatic colours are in light), and all beautiful, still rather perplex a reader who has not been accustomed to look for them, or to consider how they may be evolved out of that original light. In attempting this, the writers would hope (following the Fathers) to take as their guides, leading interpretations in Holy Scripture itself.’

But the point on which Pusey laid especial stress was that each commentator should ‘endeavour in all good faith to introduce nothing of the writer’s own into Holy Scripture: his business being to set forth the meaning of Holy Scripture itself, to extract truths from, not to import them into it.’

‘This,’ Pusey observes, ‘the writers would desire to do, in the full conviction, that all truth does indeed lie in Holy Scripture, although individuals must necessarily be unable to see more than the skirts of it; and they therefore defer to the wisdom of those before them, and of the Church collectively, not as anything additional to Holy Scripture, but as derived from Him Who is the Wisdom of God, teaching them to understand Holy Scripture, through that Holy Spirit Who inspired it.’

‘In this attempt their hope is, not to involve the reader in controversy, but, on the contrary, to bring back whom they may, from restless and often irreverent controversies and speculations, to the deep, pure, calm waters of the river of God, hoping that by reverent contemplation and study of it, we, in God’s good time, may find the full truth, which now is too often divided among us; see its reality, which in disputation too often eludes men’s grasp; and be refreshed by it, or rather by Him Who is the Truth, instead of being dried up by controversies about it.’

‘They are also convinced, that the great bulwark against modern scepticism lies in the reverent study and unfolding of the meaning of Holy Scripture itself; that Holy Scripture so studied does carry with it the conviction of its own Divinity; and that thereby alone (with corresponding life) can the Faith be maintained against the unbelief of “the last days”¹.’

The first step to be taken was to consult Keble, who

¹ From the *Guardian*, May 26, 1847, p. 336.

was said to have completed a fragment on the Epistle to the Romans¹.

‘I am sure,’ wrote Pusey to Keble on Oct. 29, 1846, ‘that the best thing for us would be to see what you have written, as you will not object, and, as far as we can, take that as our model. It has always been a puzzle with me how to write a commentary, as well it, and everything else, might be; how to blend together critical and practical. I should like very much to see something done; and indeed it seems one of the great wants of our Church.’

Keble was quite sure that his ‘fragment’ was of no use: it had been written in days when he had not yet learned from the Fathers how the Bible should be interpreted.

‘I have been just looking,’ he wrote to Pusey on Nov. 16, ‘at the fragment of a commentary which I did many years ago on the Epistle to the Romans, and if I was not quite *sure* that it will not do, I would send it as you desire. I had no notion then of patristic interpretation, therefore the thing will not do in its substance: and the *form* of it is too analytical for a popular Comment, which I suppose is what we now chiefly want: to mention no other reasons, of which I have more than I could wish.’

Pusey wrote again to consult Keble about the editorship.

‘What do you think of the editors of the Library of the Fathers without their names? Some one I asked said, “If you three² are to take a chief part in it, it is just as well to do it openly.” Or perhaps Manning may join.’

Keble thought it more prudent that only one of the editors of the Fathers should edit the Commentary. Pusey, as Hebrew Professor, ought in any case to be named. Other names which would give more confidence than his own were those of Moberly, Mill, Manning, Isaac Williams. Keble’s observations upon the character of the proposed Commentary, upon the sense and degree in which the Fathers could be embodied in it, upon the methods by which it might be made, in a good sense, popular, will be read with interest, even in days when commentaries abound as they do in our own.

¹ This has been published, since Mr. Keble’s death, in ‘*Studia Sacra*.’ Oxford, Parker, 1877. Cf. pp. 45-148.

² Keble, Pusey, Marriott.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Jan. 19, 1847.

. . . As to the Commentary, all of us here most welcome the plan and wish it undertaken : I *long* to be helpful in it, but somehow I do not feel that it is in me. I cannot please myself with anything that I have tried of the kind, but I shall not be easy till I have endeavoured and sent you a specimen. Do you mean that all the interpretations should be strictly patristical, or only on patristic principles? I should suppose, the latter: were it only for this reason, that so much of the Scriptures is not included (is it not so?) in what remains of the ancient Commentators. In the historical parts, I suppose it will be desirable to be as *descriptive* as reverence and discretion will allow. It will help to meditation, and will recommend the book in the same manner as pictures do. Then will it not be necessary to break up the whole into short sections, not adhering to our received divisions of chapter and verse except where the sense loses little or nothing by it? And I suppose, where the original gives a clear reference to some other text which is lost by our present translation, we may without undutifulness explain and supply it: our marginal translations giving a kind of warrant for the process. The sections should be short, and the paragraphs, and the sentences not involved: and N.B. *the print large and clear*: this last point is worth sacrificing a great deal for. I would circulate a specimen of the type with the Prospectus. Everything which illustrates the Prayer-book and ritual of the Church should be especially brought out: and for such a neighbourhood as this it would be a great thing to have the *rural* illustrations and allusions which take up so much of the SS. made much of, as corresponding with men's daily tasks. . . .

Pusey was especially anxious to secure the co-operation of Archdeacon Manning. But the Archdeacon declined to be one of the editors. Would he then contribute something to the work that was to be edited?

'It is in your line,' wrote Pusey to him on Feb. 17, 1847. 'Whom can we look to for doing anything to draw out the meaning of the Gospel for the poor, if you do not? Must we own things are so confused, that no one has leisure to study Holy Scripture, or put down some of its meaning for others?'

Manning was hurt at this last sentence, to which he ascribed, not altogether unjustly, a certain exaggeration. He again declined to take part in the Commentary; and for reasons, the force of which could not be disputed. Pusey, with his incessant and inexhaustible energy, was too

apt, perhaps, to forget that everybody cannot usefully attempt everything.

ARCHDEACON MANNING TO E. B. P.

Lavinston, Feb. 20, 1847.

... One of the worst causes of estrangement I have met with in particular minds has been this exaggerated way of describing our state. Particular persons have confused themselves, and see things through their own atmosphere. It seems to me that the way to make confusion is for us to fill our hands over-full of work. Our several places assign a certain kind of measure of work to each, and I think we shall do it least insufficiently by not (without due cause) increasing it.

It is because I am thankful that I am able to keep out of confusion that I have refused and do continually refuse proposals of all kinds which do not seem to fall within my duty or power to do as they ought to be done. Yours is only one of many. It is also because by this means I am able to secure such a quantity of leisure as to diminish my insufficiency in some small degree for other real works of a spiritual sort that I wish to decline every additional employment I can. And it is also because I see so many men all round me, abundantly able, and with abundant leisure to do what you wish, that I feel no reluctance, except from my affection to you, in declining it.

It is very difficult for us to transfer ourselves to another man's place. I trust I have never urged anything on you beyond your power. Let me say that I doubt whether any one without a cure of souls can quite measure the time taken up in serving others: and I may add that this is the lesser demand on my time.

In a word, then, it is because I wish to avoid in myself personally the confusion from which we are happily free that I feel my first answer to be right.

Now, my dear friend, do not think I have written this with a shadow of soreness. I know your tender and affectionate regard too well to be even in danger of it. . . .

Yours unworthily but affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

Dr. Moberly would not undertake a share in the editorship; Dr. Mill declined with great regret; Isaac Williams was not well enough. Pusey, no doubt, made a mistake in thinking that any man, however busy, if he were only learned and devout, could find time for a great and most responsible work: he had to fall back upon Keble and Marriott, with himself, and this ultimately resolved itself into himself, as sole contributor and editor of the Commentary on the Minor Prophets. But this

contraction of a noble plan was the result of time and disappointments. For the moment Pusey was full of enthusiasm and hope.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Second Sunday in Lent [March 1], 1847.

. . . Now comes what is of great moment, the writers. I have expressed to your brother the hope that you, with perhaps his help and Isaac Williams and Wilson, could undertake the Gospels. Forgive me speaking about yourself, but I thought that what you said about writing as vividly as reverence permitted, belonged to you rather than to any of us, besides other things for which I should like you to undertake them.

C. M[arriott] is willing to undertake anything which is given him ; i. e. he has studied several parts, but none so especially as to make it his own *ἔργον*. If you and others could undertake the Gospels, then he might be able to choose.

Would S. Rickards be able to help? I know not why he has done nothing. He is an able person, is he not?

Could Moberly undertake some book of Holy Scripture, although he cannot edit?

Did Wilson or any other whom you know express a wish or readiness to undertake the Book of Genesis? Some one did: I forget who.

I think you named Butler of Wantage. I suppose he has not very much reading yet. Do you yourself know him to be qualified?

In the Old Testament, C. M. and I have been thinking of Copeland (only you will, if you please, bid him work, and not destroy what he does, as is his way), Cornish, Burgon, Spranger, Barrow, perhaps Prichard of Balliol, Al. Forbes.

Do you know of any others? Jeffreys? I know so little or nothing of people's minds and qualifications.

Laprimaudaye will help, but I do not know whether in the Old or New Testament. It is a very great work, but its very greatness seems to buoy me up and make me hope that it comes from God, and that He wills it to be done.

Would you like any other title for the Commentary than 'Commentary for the Unlearned'? I could not say the 'poor,' because I fear its expense: but I thought we might supply clergy for their parishioners at trade price.

I have written to J. Mozley about it, who takes interest in it: he rather recommends its being a quarto, as it would be more of a family book, and not much dearer than a large octavo: only the difference of paper and working off.

It would then probably be better to bring out the work in parts, as was done with Mant's Bible.

If C. M. were to set to work now, he would be able to bring out something by next year. . . .

Your very affectionate and grateful son,

E. B. P.

In his sanguine manner Pusey made the most of any encouragement.

'The prospects of the Commentary,' he wrote to Keble a week later, 'are going on well. Spranger is longing to set to work on the Psalms; your brother, whom I have referred to you, is ready to work; Barrow of Queen's is at work on the Books of Samuel, and there are others who, I hope, will work when they have a pattern to go upon.'

Keble replies that he had no doubt of Wm. Butler's competency, and that he would press the other writers whom Pusey had named to select their own work. In a later letter, Keble objected to Pusey's proposal that he should provide a 'specimen' of the Commentary. 'I *cannot* do it,' he writes on April 21, 'and you *must* not press me for it: it will be a great deal better for the plan to have your "specimen" not interfered with by others.'

A day later Pusey sends to Keble a list of some contributors to the Old Testament.

Genesis	T. Morris.
Exodus, Leviticus	Spranger.
Joshua, Judges	Kay.
1 Samuel sqq.	Barrow, Queen's.
Psalms	Spranger.
Ecclesiastes	Copeland.
Isaiah	Perhaps I.
Jeremiah	G. Williams, King's.
Minor Prophets	I.

He adds:—

'C. Marriott is to take the Epistle to the Romans. May we think of the Gospels as undertaken by you, your brother, Isaac Williams, and Wilson? They ought to be done by persons working together. Then one might go on to ask Moberly and others what they would take.'

Keble was so far carried away by Pusey's eagerness that he consented at last to write 'something of a specimen of the way in which I could perhaps manage part of a Commentary.' But, he added, 'it must not be printed as a specimen, nor shown, except to be criticized, without my

leave.' Pusey hoped 'that the specimen would not be short. The sort of commentary I am trying to compile on the Minor Prophets is very long, and there should be some proportion.'

Pusey's further intercourse with Keble on this subject took place during a visit to Hursley and to Hayling Island in the Long Vacation of 1847. But he was constantly writing on the subject to other contributors. Here is his idea of what a commentary on Genesis should be, stated in correspondence with the Rev. T. E. Morris, Student of Christ Church, who was to undertake that part of the work. It offers a singular contrast to the most modern projects for elucidating the first book of Holy Scripture. In such projects the commentator is too much occupied with assigning the several portions of the book to earlier writers (who are supposed to represent different, or hostile, but always crude theological conceptions) to allow himself time to notice that everything, or almost everything, that can give it religious worth or interest, has disappeared.

E. B. P. TO REV. T. E. MORRIS.

Tuesday in 3rd week in Lent, 1847.

I send you a prospectus of what we were speaking of. I hope that we shall have several setting to work soon. Did you express a preference for Genesis? You ought to work on the Old Testament, having studied Hebrew. Our plan is to read all we can of the Fathers or old writers on it. On Genesis there is good store; our idea is to condense and rewrite, in short sentences, if we can, giving the cream, or what seems most edifying, drawing it out of the text itself and then dwelling upon it, or expanding it, as seems best.

I could lend you some of the most important vols. to take to Elstree—as

Tostatus.

Rhabanus Maurus.

Corn. a Lap.

Dionys. Carthus. (I hope).

Then, if you cannot get at them,

Origen.

St. Cyril Alex.

St. Aug.

(St. Ambrose you can have in 8vo).

St. Chrys.

These will give you probably most which you want.

It puts me into good heart to think of it. It is a great work, if God give us strength. It is to be in 4to, so there will be good space for writing.

In more difficult parts, I suppose we shall comment on verse by verse, elsewhere by sections, and so I suppose mostly in Genesis. . . .

For some years after this the Commentary fell into the background. The Gorham controversy, and the secessions which followed it, made other labours imperatively necessary: some of the writers dropped their task; others published in a separate form what they had begun for Pusey. Pusey himself suspended—he only suspended—his own share in it. When he resumed it some years later it was practically as sole contributor and sole editor. He had hoped in 1847 that such a project of work would afford to some friends a healthy relief from the controversial anxieties of the immediately preceding years: Holy Scripture would restore a sense of the true relative proportions of questions which had in some cases been exaggerated or disturbed. ‘The very thought of such a plan,’—he wrote to Keble,—‘would tend to give some people courage which they want.’ In later years Pusey bitterly lamented the failure of this—the most cherished project of his life;—except so far as his own share in it was concerned, it was a failure. The reason is not only to be found in the painful and engrossing events of the time: a great common work, such as was projected, required the stimulus and concert which nothing but constant intercourse could supply. The Tracts had been fed by the Theological Society which met at Pusey’s house: the Library of the Fathers was due to the constant and intimate intercourse of the editors with each other and with others at Oxford in the earlier days of the Movement. When the Commentary was proposed, the events of 1845 had led to ‘the Dispersion’; and, unless Pusey could have succeeded—which may well be doubted—in re-establishing at Oxford a company of men, with a common enthusiasm and definite aims, it was almost inevitable that the great plan of giving to the Church of England a Commentary on Holy Scripture, written with all the knowledge its editors could command, and at the same time in thorough harmony with Patristic teaching, should

come to nothing. Those who were dispersed however were spreading Church principles in another way.

The year 1847 witnessed another phase of the controversy about Dr. Hampden. Lord John Russell had in the early part of the year signified to the Archbishop of Canterbury his intention to recommend Dr. Hampden for a Bishopric. It is a sign how little influence the convictions of orthodox Churchmen had at that time on political leaders that, in spite of what had previously happened, the appointment was contemplated. But the secessions of 1845 had weakened the High Church party so seriously that no formidable resistance need at the moment be apprehended from that quarter. It was also thought that such an appointment would be a tribute to the memory of Dr. Arnold, whose 'Life and Correspondence' had among certain circles commanded much sympathy and admiration.

The translation of Dr. Musgrave, Bishop of Hereford, to the See of York, vacant by the death of Archbishop Harcourt on Nov. 5, 1847, enabled the Prime Minister to carry out his intention. On Nov. 15 *The Times* announced the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the vacant Bishopric; at the same time observing, that there was 'no party worth taking into account' to which such an appointment could be agreeable, and frankly describing it as a political blunder.

Pusey's relation to this, the last phase of a controversy which had begun in 1836, was, as compared with the earlier phases, inconsiderable and indirect. He felt that he was out of court: that the condemnation of his sermon, and the secession of his friends, made it impossible for him to take prominent leadership. When, writing to the Bishop of Oxford, Lord John Russell stated that 'Dr. Pusey must be considered the leader and oracle of Dr. Hampden's opponents,' he was merely trusting to common report, and perhaps was ready enough to associate the opposition to Dr. Hampden with the whole weight of unpopularity that, at that time, attached to Pusey's name. The Re-

monstrance of thirteen Bishops against the appointment, and the action of the Dean and Chapter of Hereford, were resolved upon, it need hardly be said, without any consultation with Pusey; and the opposition to Dr. Hampden's confirmation at Bow Church was primarily the work of Keble, although, as was natural, Pusey concurred and assisted in it. However, Pusey could hardly have allowed events to take their course without any interference on his own part; such inaction, at such a time, on his part, would have shaken the confidence of many who trusted him, and whom his influence and example held in loyalty to the Church of England.

On the day of the announcement of Dr. Hampden's appointment to Hereford, he wrote to Harrison, as having the ear of the Primate. After referring to the recent appointment of Dr. Prince Lee to the new See of Manchester, Pusey continues:—

Nov 15, 1847.

And now comes this appointment of Dr. Hampden. I doubt not that his own views have been amended through that note which was put upon them in 1836; that he struck back out of a very perilous course which he was in, and took refuge in the popular theology as most akin to liberalism. Still he has most pointedly refused to retract any of the very grievous things which he said, and by which he gave great scandal to the Church; and you too, when the Heads of Houses proposed to repeal the Statute, satisfied yourself that he had not removed the ground of the censure.

I suppose that the offence actually continues since the Bampton Lectures have been obstinately defended and are still on sale, I imagine. Probably his elevation to the Episcopate might be hindered at Bow Church. But it would be more satisfactory if from him, as from Mr. Gobat, a statement could be obtained which should satisfy the Church that, however he explained what he had done, he adhered to the sound expression of the Faith now.

God have mercy! The times are very dark, though with light in them.

The Hampden question could not but enter into Pusey's correspondence. The practical question was whether any and what steps could be taken to prevent the confirmation of the appointment. Archdeacon Churton had discouraged resistance: Pusey replied with some of his old fire:—

E. B. P. TO ARCHDEACON CHURTON.

Nov. 23, 1847.

Many of these secessions do more harm by paralyzing us than even in themselves. It seems as if this trouble were allowed to bring together by a common pressure those who were scattered. Earnest Evangelicals feel it. As for secular, i. e. worldly persons, they will rail on, and say it is all party faction. They have been saying so from the first. It harms only those who like to believe lies. I do most earnestly protest against being hindered from anything by what people say, or by the Archbishops, if it were so, betraying us. A protest is essential, else we connive at heresy. This has been unsettling people, and I suppose did unsettle dear Newman more than anything, 'a strong principle of heresy living and energizing in the Church.'

We have had too much of 'let alone.' H. J. Rose warned us before Dr. H.'s first appointment (I have his letter) that evil would come unless something was done: there was something written in the *British Magazine*, but it was too late. If you do not protest now, it will be too late when you groan under him as Archbishop of Canterbury. . . .

He will be opposed at Bow Church, if by no others, by J. K[eble].; but anything which is done will strengthen much the hands of the Archbishops. I hear that four of the Bishops are very indignant. Petitions are going from four Rural Deaneries in the diocese of Gloucester; some are petitioning the Archbishops not to consecrate until the case has been investigated; some, their own Bishops not to assist; some apply to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford. And most, I hope, to God. It is a very serious crisis for evil or good.

J. K. is very earnest; he writes, 'The hint about petitioning the Bishops for delay seems to me an exceedingly good one.' He says, 'I hear from several quarters how earnestly people are feeling about it; Hamilton for one, I am told. Moreover, I heard on what seemed good authority that Lord J. is fascinated by Arnold's "Remains," and that this is the secret of these appointments. This makes it more than ever a matter of life and death.'

Keble's letters and action show that he felt more strongly on this subject than Pusey himself. It was, as has been said, Keble who instigated the opposition to the confirmation of Dr. Hampden at Bow Church.

E. BADELEY, ESQ., TO E. B. P.

Temple, Nov. 18, 1847.

. . . Judge Coleridge handed to me in court yesterday a letter which he had had from Keble, who seemed desirous of having 'oppositores' properly instructed to prevent the confirmation at Bow Church; but I don't know whether it is contemplated. The Judge put a quære in his note to me, as to 'the wisdom of opposing.'

A doubt was suggested by Keble whether the Stat. of *Praemunire*, or at least that of 25 Hen. VIII, c. 20, would apply to the Archbishop if he refused to consecrate upon such opposition—but I own I fear it would.

On Nov. 21 Keble writes to Pusey:—

‘I have desired Badeley to set to work regularly with the opposition, authorizing him to use my name, if no other can be found, but trusting that there will be no lack of substitutes. I should like some such persons as the Dean of Chichester, Mr. Bowden, and some respectable person of Hereford diocese: if it might be, the Archdeacon.’

Thereupon Pusey and Keble set to work to draw up articles for the ‘*oppositores*’¹ in Bow Church. and, following the advice of Dr. Addams and Dr. Harding, and of Keble’s proctor, Mr. Townsend, they endeavoured to institute a suit against Hampden in the Ecclesiastical Courts. This could only be done with the consent of Bishop Wilberforce, the Diocesan to whom Dr. Hampden, as Vicar of Ewelme², was responsible for his public language.

E. BADELEY, ESQ., TO E. B. P.

Temple, Dec. 2, 1847.

They [Dr. Addams and Dr. Harding] were very anxious that a suit should be entered in the Ecclesiastical Court against Hampden on the charge of teaching and maintaining doctrine against those of the Church of England, thinking that if a suit is actually entered against him, and they can allege this at Bow Church, it will be the most effectual mode of stopping the whole proceedings—and they suggested Letters of Request from the Bishop of Oxon for this purpose. Can this be accomplished? I agree with them in this view, for the Archbishop could hardly proceed when such a suit was pending.

After this consultation Mr. Townsend visited Oxford in order to talk the matter over with Pusey, Marriott, and J. B. Mozley. Mr. Marriott then applied to the Bishop of Oxford for Letters of Request, by which the case would be

¹ At a later date Keble characteristically made himself responsible for the legal expenses—which Badeley estimated at 2000*l.* There is no doubt that Pusey did not allow the burden to fall on him alone. ‘Keble,’ wrote Badeley to Pusey on Jan. 21, 1848, ‘has sent me the guaranty for the costs signed by himself only: do you

know of any others who would be willing to join with him?’ The object was that ‘the expense should not fall on those who were put forward as the nominal objectors.’

² The Vicarage of Ewelme was at this time united to the Regius Professorship of Divinity.

transferred to the Court of Arches. The Bishop promised to grant these letters, and on Dec. 16 actually signed them; but he withdrew them when he was legally advised that, in granting them, he was expressing a judgment adverse to Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy¹. He afterwards explained that he had granted them under the idea that he had no power to refuse. Under the influence of the Provost of Oriel, he read through the Bampton Lectures, and arrived at 'the conviction that they did not justly warrant those suspicions of unsoundness to which they had given rise, and which so long as he trusted to selected passages, he himself shared².'

The letter to Dr. Hampden in which the Bishop of Oxford made this statement exposed him to a great deal of criticism at the hands of Bishop Phillpotts³ and others; to Pusey and Keble it seemed a disaster at least as serious as the publication of the Bampton Lectures themselves.

E. B. P. TO REV. C. MARRIOTT.

114 Marine Parade, Brighton,
Sunday evening, Jan. 2, 1848.

... The mischief of the Bishop's letter is, that it pronounces, almost *ex cathedra*, that the language of the B[ampton] L[ectures] is hardly an object of slight blame in the English Church. You recollect how you spoke of them, that in every third page there was something which grated against one in matters of faith. At least, so I understood you speaking to Mr. T[ownsend]. And yet all which the Bishop says in censure is, 'I long for the manifestation of a more reverential spirit, in the discussion of the highest mysteries of our faith,' and in the same sentence, he designates it 'a thoughtful and able history of the formation of dogmatic terminology.' It were enough to make the hair of a sensitive person stand on an end. Between ourselves, strictly, Dodsworth was greatly troubled at it. He said, 'It makes one ask, Can this indeed be a part of the Church of Christ which, while it is so jealous of any sympathy with the other branches, tolerates anything on the side of heresy?' This strictly for yourself that *you* may not undervalue the effect of the Bishop's letter. I agree with D. that it is far more injurious to the Church than Dr. Hampden's appointment. An act of tyranny hurts not the Church; the betrayal by her own guardians does. The Bishop can hardly have thought that he was virtually sanctioning the use of the language of the Bampton Lectures in any pulpit in his diocese, except as far as it was impractical, yet language

¹ 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' i. 486.

² Ibid. i. 487.

³ Ibid. i. 489-493.

as irreverent. And henceforward, with his quasi-judicial sanction, the Bampton Lectures are to take their place, along with Bishop Burnet, as part of the manifold exposition of the theology of the English Church. I think his letter is the greatest blow the Church has had since Newman's secession. And just now N. has returned, alas !

I am not disturbed, because I never attached any weight to the Bishops. It was perhaps the difference between Newman and me : he threw himself upon the Bishops and they failed him ; I threw myself on the English Church and the Fathers as, under God, her support. . . .

Pusey wrote on the spur of the moment, and under the influence of his conversation with Mr. Dodsworth ; and it must be admitted that his way of speaking of the Bishop's letter betrays something like panic, or at any rate a disturbance of his wonted judgment. Keble's estimate of the situation was calmer. But he, like Pusey, thought that C. Marriott was disposed to underrate the mischief of the Bampton Lectures and the seriousness of attempts on the part of authority to extenuate their real purpose.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Cras Epiph., 1848.

. . . It is surprising to me that C. M. should not think more of H[ampden]'s holding that which is = all heresies put together, viz. plain Latitudinarianism. But I put it down partly to his being out of health. I trust there will be such a rally against Rationalism that it will quite outweigh the result of this one bad appointment. Have you seen Moberly's article on Arnold and Bunsen ? It *must* have its weight. I quite agree with C. M.'s opinion that if people swerve to Rome for such things as this, they must be very odd kind of people. R. C.s might much more reasonably come to us on account of Archbishop MacHale preaching up murder.

Your most affectionate

J. K.

Notwithstanding the withdrawal of the Letters of Request, Pusey and Keble were busily engaged in preparing theological matter for the use of counsel at Bow Church.

'I found things,' writes Pusey to Marriott on Jan. 2, 1848, 'in Godliman Street, in most utter confusion. Our articles of indictment

just in the state in which they were sent in. The heads of K.'s articles (that is his preamble) not fitted in into the sequel (the allegations). I spent five and a half hours there on Friday, and put them to rights : at least ready to be copied out.'

A great deal of time, which neither Pusey nor Keble could well afford, was devoted in the winter of 1847-48 to the task of presenting an elaborate theological criticism, such as might be used in a legal argument, on Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures. It was all lost labour. On Dec. 28 the Chapter of Hereford elected Dr. Hampden as their Bishop; the Dean, and the Rev. H. Huntingford, B.C.L., Canon Residentiary, dissenting. At the confirmation which was held in Bow Church on Jan. 11 there was no theological argument whatever. The only point on which the Vicar-General and Dr. Lushington would hear arguments was whether—notwithstanding the 'praeconisations' with which the proceedings were opened by the Apparitor-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury, inviting all objectors to the confirmation to come forward and make their objections in due form of law—any objector was to be heard at all. It was ruled that the law did not allow any opposition whatever to the confirmation of the election.

This legal decision shocked a great many of the clergy and serious people because it seemed to reduce the act of confirmation to an ostentatious unreality; and the question was asked whether it would not be better to give up forms which had ceased to be anything better than idle formalities. Pusey, who especially felt the danger of seeming to invoke the Name of God to sanction such proceedings, yet would be no party to abandoning a usage which once had afforded to the Church protection against unfit pastors, and might in better times do so again.

E. B. P. TO ARCHDEACON HARRISON.

114 Marine Parade [Brighton], Jan. 14, 1848.

Nothing depends upon me else I would not give up the shred of an old form, even if it lay to rot, like dung on the face of the earth. I should hope it might still, in its very decay, help forward the shooting

of the new life, whenever God should give it. They are at least a witness of what we have had, what a Church ought to have, what through our sins we have lost, what we should pray for, and be humbled that we have not. It is certainly humbling enough, if (as the late explanation of the Statute goes) there is no help whatever, if any person, however unfit, whether on moral or doctrinal grounds, be chosen by the Minister of the day for a Bishop, except in a resistance to the law. We shall see, I trust, whether this interpretation be right. At least I believe there is the Queen's Bench yet, and the Queen in Council.

But supposing these adverse, we are in a different position from what you imagined us to be in when I wrote to you. One need not be impatient, or wish to throw away the very shadow of a shade. 'Son of man, can these bones live?' I would not part with the very dust into which what once had life was dissolved. It is a memorial of better days past, and when it really pitieth God's servants to see her in the dust, He will raise her up. Only if there is to be any hope of a restoration, people must see and acknowledge that they are in an evil case. Moses was sent when the children of Israel cried to God by reason of the bondage. When fresh burdens were put upon them they complained to their very oppressors. I too shall deprecate any disposition in Churchmen to sweep these forms away; but I should deprecate still more if they were to acquiesce, as by a sort of optimism, and not feel that we are in a worse position than when you could write confidently to me a few weeks ago, that 'the Archbishop would feel that there was a constitutional remedy provided by the confirmation at Bow Church.' . . .

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

Still, the decision of the Vicar-General and Dr. Lushington at Bow Church was challenged in the Court of Queen's Bench, to which, on Jan. 24, an application was made for a *mandamus* compelling the Archbishop of Canterbury to hear objections to the confirmation of Dr. Hampden. The application fell to the ground, as the judges were equally divided; Mr. Justice Coleridge and Mr. Justice Patteson being in favour of granting the rule, Lord Denman and Mr. Justice Erle against it. The objectors were represented by Mr. Badeley, among others, who reported to Pusey as follows:—

Feb. 20, 1848.

'My speech gave satisfaction both in Court and out of it; even Lord Denman spoke highly of it; but I have reason to think it made an important impression on Judges Patteson and Coleridge. . . . The

aid you gave me was very important ; and I have to thank you very much for your kindness.'

The eloquent conclusion to Mr. Badeley's argument states the issue which was presented to the Court with clearness :—

'My Lords, the question whether Dr. Hampden is fit or unfit for any particular bishopric shrinks into absolute insignificance when compared with the question now before your Lordships. The influence for good or evil of any single Bishop can be but limited in its extent, and short in its duration. He will soon die and be buried ; and the good or the evil which he may do may in a few years cease to be felt. But, my Lords, the appointment of Bishops, the right of the Crown to nominate without appeal, and without control, and without any responsibility at all, is to continue for ever. The injury therefore to the Church of England, if its pastors are thus to be forced upon it at the mere beck of the Prime Minister of the day, will be incalculable ; for a succession of prelates may thus be perpetuated who may be a disgrace to Christendom. God forbid, my Lords, that that should ever be so ! but undoubtedly it may happen ; it may be even more than possible, if your Lordships discharge this rule.'

Eventually Dr. Hampden was consecrated at Lambeth on March 26 ; the Bishops of London and Winchester are said to have declined to take part in the ceremony.

CHAPTER VII.

CARE OF THE POOR — IRISH FAMINE — FREE TRADE—
GLADSTONE'S ELECTION FOR OXFORD UNIVERSITY—
ADMISSION OF JEWS TO PARLIAMENT — DECEASED
WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

1845-1849.

AMIDST the din of controversy, Pusey lost none of that interest in social and philanthropic questions which had distinguished his earlier years. This interest was sustained not only by his own conviction of the essentially religious character of such questions, but by his intercourse with his elder brother, of whose public life they formed a prominent if not an engrossing feature. He was, for instance, very keenly interested in the question of helping the poor, especially in Ireland. In February, 1845, his brother had paid him a visit at Christ Church; and their conversation had mainly turned on the subject. He followed up the talk by an earnest letter, which concludes in the following words :—

March 4, 1845.

'Life is whirling on rapidly with both of us : each year seems to me more intensely rapid; and this, my dear Philip, will be a blessed close of your course, to be the benefactor of the poor of Christ. "Seek judgment, righten the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." This will be far better than any such occupation such as I have heard you express the wish you had been early engaged in, as a lawyer's : for these end in themselves ; they furnish an occupation and there end. Loving, earnest exertions for Christ's poor last beyond the grave. "I never remember to have read," says the aged St. Jerome (and he was most widely read), "I never remember to have read that any died by an evil death, who readily showed works of mercy. He

hath many intercessors, and it cannot be but that the prayers of many should be heard." Has He not Himself said, "Whatsoever ye have done to one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me"? . . .

'God bless you ever, my dear Philip.'

In deference to his brother's suggestion Philip Pusey formed a plan of riding round Ireland, with a view to making accurate observations of the condition of the Irish peasantry. In a letter to his brother, he writes :—

July 31, 1845.

The case of the Irish peasantry seems to me very strong, and though their murders and cruelties should not be palliated, their combinations seem to me to have been founded on the preservation of their families from starvation, because the possession of land is their sole dependence since they have had neither employment nor poor-rate to look to. However, I hope to be able to go over, and that some good or other may come of it.

Your affectionate brother,

PH. PUSEY.

Mr. Gladstone was to have accompanied Mr. Pusey in the projected Irish tour. *The Times*, however, anticipated them, by sending a Commissioner to Ireland whose reports appeared to exhaust the subject. Pusey had earnestly desired that his brother might concentrate his mind on one definite and philanthropic object in his political life; and feared a fresh disappointment might throw him into a despondent inactivity. To Mr. Gladstone he writes :—

Christ Church, Sept. 3, 1845.

'I have just seen Philip at Pusey, and was very grieved to find him in bad spirits about giving up his Irish tour with you, and yet feeling that *The Times* reporter had taken his work completely out of his hands, and that there was now no longer any object for him. I am very sorry for it, for I had looked forward with great pleasure to his having such an employment for his mind, and to his travelling with you. . . . It is sad to think of his clear mind left without any adequate occupation, to waste itself, because it has none, and that he might do much for the moral restoration of our land, and no one employs him. I do not wish for any merely political employment for him; but I think Sir R[obert] P[eel] has made a miserable mistake in not finding out some unpaid employment in which he might turn his clear mind to good account.'

To Philip himself, after much sympathy and encouragement, he writes :—

‘Christ Church, Oct. 6, 1845.

“‘Cheerily on,” then, my dear Philip; I find it such a comfort to commend myself and my own work to God, and then to trust to Him what becomes of it. And so nothing discourages me. I am heavy-hearted at times: but I spring up again: and I find that nothing relieves heavy-heartedness so much, as to be at work for God, in what measure one may. And yours is such, as well as mine, for it is for His poor. You cannot think what a relief it is, at the beginning of each of one’s employments, to commit it and oneself, if but in one thought, to God. It so lightens everything. And then one may go on, as if one were not one’s self, or working for one’s self, but for Him. And one trusts that He will bring it to good somehow. And He has signally blessed you last year. To have undone that gripping Scotch Report, and brought people to think of the poor in Scotland, and see how to relieve them, would be no slight thing, were it a work of a whole life.

‘So that be of good cheer, and may He ever cheer and bless you.’

The Irish famine of 1847, as might be anticipated, laid great hold on Pusey’s mind: and he was delighted at the appointment of Wednesday, March 24, as a fast-day, on which the nation, in view of this judgment, was to humble itself before God.

‘How,’ he wrote to Keble, ‘would you advise one to observe the day of humiliation? . . . I am to be in London, and have (alas for me) six general confessions (I mean six confessions of a life) to receive. Would it be wrong to receive one on that day, if one humbled oneself all the while as much as one could?’

Keble replied: ‘Receiving confessions seems to me a most appropriate work for the fast-day. It is so great an humiliation.’ Pusey, who was staying with his mother at 35 Grosvenor Square, spent the day—indeed, the whole week before and after—in very hard work. His way of spending Sundays in London at this time is described incidentally by his mother :—

‘Feb. 1, 1847.

‘Edward preached at Margaret Street at the e’even o’clock service yesterday; he went out of the house at seven o’clock, and did not return for his breakfast until half-past two, and preached at Mr. Dodsworth’s at seven, and had some gentlemen to call upon him here near ten o’clock. . . . He was up a great part of Saturday night, writing his sermons.’

The fast-day was observed with every outward mark of solemnity and strictness. Many columns of *The Times* were devoted to reports of sermons in the metropolis; and that journal stated that every shop in London was closed, with the exception of a Quaker's. Pusey's remarkable sermon¹ at Margaret Chapel shows how intimately the preacher had made himself acquainted both with the general character and the particular details² of Irish misery, which he describes with the accuracy of an inspector's report, but with the intensity of Holy Scripture:—

'Deaths are now uncounted, counted here and there by fifties or by hundreds; but the dead are often buried unheeded, uncoffined, unwept, amid the extremity of misery, by those who loved them most. "There are no widows to make lamentation." The husband carries his wife's uncoffined remains, the brother his sister, the mother her child, without a tear, to the grave; the inward misery and cry to God, the only prayer over their remains! The prophet's words seem fulfilled, "Weep ye not for the dead, neither bemoan him"; or again, "I praised the dead that are already dead, more than the living which are yet alive³."

Another passage may be quoted:—

'They who witness it say, "It exceeds all, save the siege of Jerusalem." Horrors there are, which one could scarce name except in the solemnity of Scripture language. The curse on the house of Ahab is fulfilled on members of Christ, "Him that dieth of Ahab in the city shall the dogs eat." More horrible yet is the temptation to sin; for what must be the misery where, for a morsel of food, one man could be found to murder two children! Well-nigh all the sorrows of the Lamentations over the city, "once full of people, that sitteth solitary," are there; "the tongue of the sucking child cleaveth to the roof of his mouth for thirst"; the young children, hundreds upon hundreds in one city⁴, "ask for bread, and no man breaketh it unto them."

¹ 'Chastisements neglected fore-runners of greater,' published in 'Occasional Parochial Sermons,' sermon vi. Parker, 1865.

² Pusey refers to the 'Narrative of a Journey from Oxford to Skibbereen,' by Lord Dufferin and the Hon. G. F. Boyle (the late Earl of Glasgow). They were at the time undergraduates at Christ Church, and they persuaded some of their fellow-students to give up all luxuries for a given time and

devote the proceeds to the relief of the starving Irish. Other sources of information were Mr. Elihu Burritt's journal of a visit of three days to Skibbereen and its neighbourhood; and a great many private letters, giving details 'too horrible to be published.'

³ 'Chastisements neglected fore-runners of greater,' pp. 17, 18. ('Occasional Sermons.')

⁴ Galway.

But sympathy with suffering, and even present self-denial with a view to relieving it, would be unequal to the demands of the occasion, if they did not lead to some efforts to resist the habits of luxury, which, in Pusey's judgment, were increasing their hold, with fatal effect, on modern life. It must be remembered that he was preaching to a well-dressed congregation, some of them related to the wealthiest people in the country.

'Whatever amendments there may have been among us, luxury and self-indulgence have been increasing among us: no class has been contented with the expenditure of their forefathers; new luxuries have invaded us; luxuries have become comforts, and comforts have become necessities and our idols. In its turn, luxury is the parent of covetousness; and covetousness of unjust gain, and of the grinding of the poor. We *will* not limit our self-indulgence; and so in order to obtain it cheaply, we pare down the wages of our artisans. They who have seen it, know that full often the very clothes we wear are, while they are made, moistened by the tears of the poor. How has the same desire of cheapness, to vie with others, impaired the character of our trade, and made practices common which our forefathers would have counted, what they are, dishonesty!'

Sir Robert Peel's Bill for the repeal of the Corn Laws interested Pusey deeply. He probably did not give much thought to its political bearings, but he wished it well, as a measure designed for the relief of the poor. Again, writing to his brother on the question of the endowment of Roman Catholicism, he says:—

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

Christ Church, June 13, 1846.

For myself, I hope that everything done *for* the Roman Catholics will work to good, both in doing away irritation at present, and tending ultimately to bring us together. I do not see anything to object to in giving seats to Irish Roman Catholic bishops, or endowing Colleges for them, or paying their clergy if they would receive it. I do not see anything amiss, or any principle violated, in doing anything *positively* for the R. C.s.

But 'robbing Paul to pay Peter' never does any good. Be it ever so much that they were ill-treated at the Reformation (although all their Bishops came over), yet there is not more of Church property, after all the miserable squandering, than is sufficient for the needs of the English-speaking Irish Church. They say, too, that the Irish

Church will not accept it. It is worse than the fable of the dog in the manger, to desire to deprive others of what they do not want themselves, to bring them down, without raising themselves. I objected to the Appropriation Clause, because I think it went to confiscate Church property to secular purposes. No blessing ever came of this or will come. This wealthy nation, which could afford—was it twenty millions or forty?—for a theory about slavery, can do what it will, if it will. Or, at least, let people be consistent. If the act was wrong, let them begin by undoing their own share in it. The spoliation of monasteries, which was a real robbery of the poor, which all acknowledge to have been the original cause of the evil system of the poor-laws, is as bad as any one can make out the transfer of Church property in Ireland. Let people come to such work with clean hands. If the Dukes who possess Church property, Whig or Conservative, would give up what no one can doubt was wrongfully given them, they may say what they will about the Church in Ireland. I examined the subject, you will recollect, very carefully some years ago, according to the returns of the Commissioners, and I found that almost every case of inadequate provision for our poor people had its root in the transfer of monastic property. The monks did provide for their wants: their ecclesiastical non-resident successors have been learning to do it: the laymen have done nothing.

I did not mean, however, to get into this subject. My object in writing this letter was to show how far I go along with you. I should think that people will bear anything done positively for the Roman Catholics; that they will not bear spoliation.

For myself, I am more and more indifferent to everything outward, in my inward self: and that from the deep conviction that things are in higher Hands than ours, and that He

‘shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will.’

There is an inward life in the Church (I do not mean, of course, in the clergy) which ever thrives in difficulties, and draws life out of death.

God bless you ever.

The brothers were not at one on the Irish Church question. Mr. Pusey had supported the suppression of the Irish bishoprics in 1833: but the subject was not referred to between them except indirectly. Pusey's method was to drop extinct controversies, and to make the most of present occasions for suggesting or doing good. The relations between the brothers may be illustrated by one more letter, written in the autumn of the year of Pusey's illness at Tenby.

E. B. P. TO PHILIP PUSEY, ESQ., M.P.

Pusey, Vigil of St. Simon and St. Jude, 1846.

... I will not say many words of thanks for all the kind thought for me and my children; but I pray daily that we may all be gathered together, where there is no weariness, nor sickness, nothing to harass without, no sinking of the heart within, no sorrowful memories, nor heavy anticipations, no combats, nor sins, nor failings, but the everlasting, ever-blessing Presence of God.

To this end, I cannot say with how very much of interest I see any and every exertion of yours for the poor: for I believe that the prayers of the poor for us here are among our best treasures, and good deeds done for them a choice treasure at the Day of Account. And so politics, your seat in Parliament, agriculture, your studies, all interest me in this one way, that they may be turned to account for the poor. We, the clergy, are bound by our vows (even so far as we are employed in secular studies) to draw 'all our desires and studies that one way.' We may engage in many things, we must have one end. And one end we all have, the glory of God in the good of man; and so I will pray, and you will too, that God will accept the work of your hands, and make you an instrument of good to His poor, and, so making you, bless you here and hereafter.

God bless you all.

Your very affectionate brother,

E. B. P.

In July, 1847, Parliament was dissolved, and Mr. Estcourt, who, with his colleague Sir R. Inglis, had for many years represented the University, announced to his constituents his intended retirement. That Mr. Gladstone should be asked to become a candidate for the vacant seat was almost a matter of course. After a brilliant University career, he had forced his way rapidly to the Secretaryship of the Colonies; he had been, while still a young man, in the language of the public press, 'not only a Minister but a leading Minister.' His intimate relations with Churchmen in the University were sufficiently well known: he was in active sympathy with them; and it was well understood that his loyalty to Church principles had obliged him to make political sacrifices. He was opposed by Mr. Edward Cardwell, nephew of the Principal of St. Alban Hall. Mr. Cardwell was a man of ability and culture, but hardly likely to elicit the enthusiasm of the Uni-

versity. He had no relations with the Church movement; but as he had voted for the Maynooth grant, 'the anti-popery fire-engine'—to quote *The Times*—'played on both the candidates with absolute impartiality.'

In a short time, however, it became clear to Mr. Cardwell's Committee that he had no chance of success as against Mr. Gladstone. His name was withdrawn; and thenceforth the contest lay between Mr. Gladstone and a candidate who was already in the field, and who represented frankly the Low Church and Protectionist interest. This was Mr. C. G. Round, of Balliol College, Recorder of Colchester, and member for North Essex. Mr. Round's Oxford Committee was almost entirely composed of the opponents of Tractarianism: the only distinguished exception was Mr. William Sewell, whose presence on that Committee was a sign of the alarm with which he had been inspired by the events of 1845. The contest now was rather a religious than a political one; and Mr. Gladstone's cause was generally taken up by High Churchmen with great warmth and alacrity.

Pusey, of course, shared this feeling. He did not join Mr. Gladstone's Committee; his name, in the existing state of things, would have provoked more opposition than it could have conciliated support. Moreover, among Mr. Gladstone's supporters there were men of distinction with whom serious Churchmen could not have had much in common. But the real meaning of the contest may be gathered from a comparison of the members of the Oxford Committees: and they show that Mr. Round represented the anti-Tractarian policy of the Heads of Houses, Mr. Gladstone all that the Heads had endeavoured to crush.

The election was held in what was then the dead of the Long Vacation. The poll was opened on Thursday, July 29, and was closed on Tuesday, August 3. Mr. Gladstone was proposed by Dr. Richards, the high-minded and generous Rector of Exeter, in a speech which did justice to his subject. The Master of Balliol, Dr. Jenkyns, proposed Mr. Round. In the event, Sir R. H. Inglis, the sitting

member, was returned at the head of the poll with Mr. Gladstone as his colleague, whose majority over Mr. Round was 173.

Pusey was staying at Hayling Island; and he came up, as was then necessary, to vote for Mr. Gladstone. 'I am very thankful,' he wrote two months later to the Rev. H. A. Woodgate, 'for Gladstone's election; but we too had allies who have no great love for us or the truths we hold.' But a question soon arose which led Pusey to modify his satisfaction. On Dec. 2 Lord John Russell announced his intention of introducing on Dec. 16 a motion for the removal of the civil and political disabilities affecting her Majesty's Jewish subjects; and Mr. Gladstone intimated to Pusey, through Mr. T. D. Acland, that he should feel it his duty to support the motion. Pusey immediately sent an almost violent protest to Mr. Gladstone. At its conclusion, he says :—

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

[Dec. 13], 1847, Gloucester Gate,
Mo. night, returning to O. on Wed.

You would put great difficulties in the way of those who wish or are bound to pray for the Parliament as Christian: I could pray for it only as apostate, and as having prepared by this step for the coming of Antichrist.

I know that this is an idle protest. But as you in a manner wished me to know, I am bound in conscience to make it. I felt, when I supported you, that I should witness acts which I should regret. There was one past act (the 'godless colleges') which I deplored. Still I voted, and wished others to vote, on the plain principle of personal confidence in you as a religious statesman, who felt the responsibility of your own acts. I voted for you out of personal affection and regard for you, and the confidence which I had in you as a religious man. Had I known that you would have joined in what I account an anti-Christian measure, I could not have helped to put you in a position which would have led to such a result. I would rather, for your own soul's sake, that you had been out of Parliament.

You will not understand this as expressing a regret, either that you were elected, or that I had any share in your election. We did it with our eyes open, as to your general line of politics, though not expecting this. We have no reason to complain. It seems one more

hint to Churchmen to have nothing to do with politics. Your election seemed the one thing which could still interest me in them. If the Legislature pass this, I could take no other interest in it than, I believe, St. Paul would have had me take in Nero.

God have mercy.

In Him your affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

To this Mr. Gladstone sent an answer expressive of his sincere regard for Pusey's feelings, and a real deference to his opinions. He explained his own grounds for his action, and the pain and reluctance with which he was now prepared to surrender the view in which he had previously agreed with Pusey. He had, however, come to feel that so far from individuals only being responsible for the attenuation and corruption of the Christian profession of the State, the State had with open eyes deliberately, though gradually, withdrawn its religious tests—even for the Divinity of Christ. While influenced by the civil argument for the Jew, he was still more impressed by the danger to religion from insisting on tests, which were notoriously in very many cases mere hollow professions.

Pusey thought that government, like everything else, should be conducted on purely Christian principles. Mr. Gladstone replied, 'That any man in any country can in this age of the world give *full* effect to Christian principles in the work of government is, alas! very far beyond my belief.'

Another question—of social as well as theological importance—which at this period occupied much of Pusey's attention, was the proposal to repeal the laws which prohibit marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Even in 1840 he had been greatly concerned about an agitation in this direction: and wrote a vigorous criticism of a pamphlet which was designed to promote it¹. In this notice Pusey made use for the first time of the remarkable Epistle of

¹ *British Critic*, Oct. 1840, pp. 528 sqq. Notice of 'Observations on the prohibition of Marriage in certain

cases of relationship by affinity. Second Edition.'

St. Basil¹, which has since been so familiar and effective a feature of the controversy: but he was by no means only occupied with the Biblical aspect of the discussion.

'I wish,' he writes to Harrison on Oct. 7, 1840, 'that there could be some counter-demonstration of abhorrence and disgust: showing, too, how the repeal (of the present law) would inflict a real hardship on many who now live as brothers and sisters, but would then be separated. One advocate has already given people to understand, on Paley's maxim, that there is nothing morally offensive in any incest, beyond that of own brother and sister.'

Harrison suggests in reply that 'some party or parties were bent on such a marriage,' and he describes a peremptory refusal, on the part of Archbishop Howley, even to discuss the subject with them. Pusey threw himself into the matter with his wonted energy: suggested that the advertisements on the subject which were appearing in the papers should be collected and commented on by Mr. Maitland, the Archbishop's Librarian; explained to Harrison that on studying Lev. xviii. 6 he found that it was more decisive than he had anticipated; and, finally, wrote a letter to the *British Magazine* which might serve as a guide and encouragement to others, and which was reprinted as a separate pamphlet². His reason for this republication was that already, both in 1841 and 1842, Bills were brought into Parliament with a view to repealing more or less of the existing Law of Marriage.

From this date, so far as Pusey was concerned, the subject dropped until 1847, when it was again forced on his attention. The parish of St. Giles-in-the-Fields refused a charity to the child of a marriage with a deceased wife's sister, on the ground of the child's illegitimacy³; and at the same time a Mr. Chadwick of Liverpool based his defence against a charge of bigamy, on the ground that one of his two so-called wives was the sister of his previously deceased wife. In view of these cases, Mr. Stuart Wortley moved in

¹ Ep. 160, ad Diodorum.

E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1842.

² 'A Letter on the proposed change in the laws prohibiting Marriage between those near of kin,' by the Rev.

³ The Queen v. St. Giles-in-the-Fields, in the Court of Queen's Bench.

the House of Commons on May 13 for a 'Royal Commission to inquire into the state and operation of the Law of Marriage, as relating to the prohibited degrees of affinity; and to marriages solemnized abroad or in the British Colonies.' Sir Robert Inglis spoke against the motion, but would not divide the House; and the Commission was accordingly appointed. Mr. Edward Badeley was retained as counsel for the parish of St. Giles-in-the-Fields in the Court of Queen's Bench; and he applied to Pusey for assistance in the preparation of his argument. The substance of Pusey's replies may be gathered from the striking argument which that accomplished lawyer presented to the Judges of the Queen's Bench on June 15 and June 30, 1847¹. But, before long, Pusey had to take a more directly personal and public part in the question. Early in December, 1847, he was summoned to give evidence before the Royal Commission, which was by that date at work. And a week later (Dec. 11, 1847) his mother wrote:—

'Edward has been sadly busy of late. For *many* nights he has not gone to bed until three o'clock, and last night he sat up entirely. His business has been to enlarge the evidence which he gave when he was examined by the Commissioners about the marriage of sisters.'

This evidence, together with Mr. Badeley's speech in the Queen's Bench, he published separately in 1849², when Mr. Stuart Wortley was bringing a Bill into Parliament to legalize the hitherto prohibited unions.

It is anticipating the course of events to refer to this publication; but the opinion may here be expressed that the Preface to these two documents is the most vigorous of Pusey's contributions to the subject. When he composed it he had had time to marshal his knowledge and to consider fully all that could be said against him. All the most important evidence that was given before the Royal Commission is passed in review: Pusey's Preface is in fact

¹ Speech of Edward Badeley, Esq. Cf. Pusey's 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, &c.,' 1849, pp. 74 sqq.

² 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister prohibited by Holy Scripture

as understood by the Church for 1500 years: Evidence, &c., by E. B. Pusey, D.D.: to which is appended a Speech by Edward Badeley, Esq., M.A.' Oxford, Parker, 1849.

a Report to the public on the opinions and information offered by the other witnesses. He has to defend the existing prohibition against many lines of assault of various opponents. Mr. T. Binney, who held that bigamy as well as slavery were 'apparently tolerated' under the circumstances of the Apostolic age and by Scripture itself, is asked what authority can *he* on *his* principles produce whereby it should be forbidden now. Archbishop Whately, who held that the Levitical degrees are not binding upon Christians, is begged to consider the authority of the 'Table of forbidden degrees.' Dr. Wiseman, in order to accentuate the authority of the Roman Church, and in particular its dispensing power, had maintained that these marriages are disapproved of in the Mosaic law, yet that they are not contrary to the Christian law, but are a mere matter of ecclesiastical legislation; Pusey reminded him that, if he is right, it must follow that 'amid the hardness of heart' of the earlier people, marriages were forbidden to them which are allowed under the light and grace of the Gospel. With deep regret he reviews also the evidence of his old Oriel friend, the Rev. J. E. Tyler, who held that the Mosaic law of marriage referred to the political or municipal rather than the moral branch of the Mosaic dispensation.

Then, after summarizing the Scriptural evidence, Pusey points out that the hope that man's moral instincts will save him, if the relaxation of the Divine law is once allowed, from going further, is contrary to all that we know of human nature.

'We are disinclined to see the consequences of what we are doing. People wish to act blindfold, when they are resolved to act, and doubt what the results may be. And, on that very ground, it is of moment to open their eyes, if we can. An alarming range of lax practice is laid open in this, which is the very centre of morals. For if the Levitical degrees are abandoned, there remains no safeguard (save where and as far as the Church holds her ground), except man's natural instincts. But what are these instincts? Are they one uniform, distinct, powerful voice of nature, making herself heard equally under all circumstances, in every moral or religious condition, so that she cannot be mistaken, nor, without a convulsive shock to nature herself, be disobeyed? All experience tells us the contrary. It is against

nature itself to say that our moral instincts do not very materially depend upon our whole moral condition. Such as we ourselves are, as moral or religious agents, such are our moral instincts. These sacred instincts are not a dream, nor a mere creation of custom, because they vary indefinitely in different stages of man's moral being. God forbid! Like conscience itself, they are the Voice of God within the soul, sweeping over the very inmost strings of our moral being, although the sounds be jarring, unharmonious, uncertain, low, when the instrument itself is discordant or unattuned; the sounds are fine, and delicate, and harmonious, then only, when the Finger of God, the Holy Spirit, hath repaired and conformed it anew to that state wherein His Hand formed it, and it yields itself to His touch¹.

In acknowledging a copy of Dr. Pusey's and Mr. Badeley's joint work, which had been placed in his hands with a view to the debate on Mr. Stuart Wortley's measure, Mr. Gladstone wrote asking Pusey's assistance in preparing his own speech in opposition to the measure. Pusey readily complied with this request, and his answer, as being not without interest at this time, is printed in the Appendix.

The debate was distinguished by a long speech from Mr. Gladstone, in which he reproduced several arguments from this letter: but the motion for the second reading was carried by a majority of 34—177 to 143. The Bill, however, did not live to be read a third time during that session.

¹ 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister,' &c., by E. B. Pusey, D.D. Parker, 1849. Preface, pp. xxx, xxxi.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VII.



E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

[Christ Church], Eve of St. Mark [1849].

I am very thankful to hear of the line which you are to take on this Bill.

In answer to your questions, 1. I see nothing to be said against J. K[eble]'s interpretation of *πορνεία*, Acts xv, and the ground seems to me very strong.

2. I meant that the Early Church considered the marriage of first cousins allowable, while it held all which fell under the Levitical degrees as prohibited, and among these the wife's sister. . . . I mention (Evidence, p. 17) the first prohibition of the marriage of first cousins (in the sixth century), founded doubtless on that instinctive feeling mentioned by St. Augustine. But this did not introduce any confusion into the mind of the Church. It remained clear what was prohibited by Divine law (the Levitical degrees), what by the Church's law: see St. Thomas Aquinas (Evid. p. 25) and the Schoolmen generally. The confusion (such as now exists in the Roman Church) began when the unhappy Pope Alexander VI. dispensed with what was before accounted Divine law; for then Roman Catholics were driven to the alternatives, (a) Popes can dispense with Divine law; or (β) the Levitical law is no longer Divine law. Most, with Bishop Wiseman, take β.

3. On Lev. xviii. 18, St. Basil has said all that I see admits of being said.

The words 'as long as she liveth' may (as to the Heb.) have equally either sense you propose, 'an extensive expression giving emphasis,' or 'to limit the prohibition to the lifetime.' J. Keble, I think, takes the former in his third explanation (I have it not at hand).

One concession I made, may be limited, as to the interpretation of the Jews before our Lord. I know not whether you saw a letter from me in *The Guardian* some weeks past, before Easter. J. K. sent me, from Robert Cornish, a notice that in Deut. xxvii. 23 there is in the LXX. the interpolation *Ἐπικατάρατος ὁ κοιμώμενος μετὰ ἀδελφῆς τῆς γυναίκος αὐτοῦ*. The very existence of this addition cannot

be accounted for, except on the fact that the Alexandrian Jews, at the least, believed the marriage with the wife's sister to be prohibited by Holy Scripture—and this very much strengthens the case of the Karaites, whom one should otherwise have trusted less than the Talmudists. There is then a case of uncertainty at least, on this side, with the strong positive ground upon the other. I think the ground which you put may stand as an additional difficulty. If you take v. 18 in what seems to some its obvious sense, it would only prohibit marriage with the wife's sister in her lifetime; and if you take v. 17 in what would by itself equally seem the obvious sense, it would only prohibit marrying the step-daughter in the mother's lifetime. But it is universally confessed that a marriage with a step-daughter is against nature itself. You cannot then argue safely from what appears at first sight, if there are grave grounds on the other side.

As far as I saw myself, I felt Lev. xviii. 18 to be a difficulty as to the Old Testament, to be mitigated only. For as I saw no difficulty in admitting at the utmost (on the hypothesis)—‘Suppose then, it was conceded to the Jews, for the hardness of their hearts, that they might marry their wife's sister, after the wife's decease, and although contrary to the principle involved in Lev. xviii. 6 and 16, yet so Polygamy was conceded to them, contrary to the first principles of the law of marriage given at the Creation. It does not follow, that the one concession was meant to be extended to us, any more than the other. And those who maintain the contrary, go against the sense of the whole Christian Church, until in A.D. 1500 a monster of a Pope set the example by allowing such a marriage.’

But again, as to Lev. xviii. 18, St. Basil's second argument is a very strong one. (You would find his letter in my pamphlet some years ago, or, in the original, Ep. 160, ed. Bened.) He urges (which is evident) all sins of incest, really prohibited in the law, are not prohibited by name [e.g. the daughter], but certain incests which were the custom of the lands of Egypt and Canaan, Lev. xviii. 3. I may as well give his words. ‘The lawgiver seems not to include every sort of sins, but especially to forbid those of the Egyptians whence Israel removed, and those of the Canaanites, to whom they removed. For so stand the words (Lev. xviii. 3 quoted). So that it is probable that this sort of sin was not at that time indigenous (*ἐμπολιτεύεσθαι*) among those nations. Wherefore neither had the lawgiver any need to guard them against it, but was satisfied with untaught habit (*τῷ ἀδιδάκτῳ ἔθει*) to reprobate this defilement.’ He then meets the difficulty, ‘How then having forbidden the greater, does he pass in silence over the less?’ He answers, ‘Because the example of the Patriarch [Jacob] seemed likely to injure some fleshly persons, so that they should live with sisters together.’ ‘What then must we do? say what is written, or work out in addition to Holy Scripture (*προσεξενάγασθαι*) what is passed over in silence?’

It is little to say that I like St. Basil's mode of reasoning better than my own, and it seems to me capable of being brought out with great force. One would put first the general prohibition, Lev. xviii. 6, which has been held as the rule of the Christian Church; then, mentioning that it is obvious that all cases really prohibited are not so by name (as the daughter), one would argue from the parity of case in Lev. xviii. 16, purity being the same in both sexes, &c.—the judgment of the whole Church—our own, &c. In a word, bring out the positive grounds strongly. Then meet objection, 'But it is said that it is allowed in Lev. xviii. 18.' Ans. Take this, at its very outside, it is a prohibition of a special form of polygamy. There may have been special reasons why this polygamy should be forbidden. It does not follow, because any specific sin is not expressly included in a prohibition, therefore it is permitted; also suicide would not be forbidden. We cannot make inferences from our mere ignorance of the circumstances, why Almighty God expressly forbade one thing and not another. He had not *allowed* marriage with the wife's sister. The very utmost that could be said, would be, that in prohibiting polygamy of this sort, Almighty God had not expressly prohibited second marriage, having virtually condemned it just before, under the prohibition of the brother's wife. The Mosaic is not a complete code of legislation, giving each particular instance of what is forbidden. It is addressed to the affections, not to the intellect only. The same commandment is repeated several times, as of adultery in this very chapter, v. 20, although it had been already forbidden in the Decalogue; a person's gleaning his own fields is prohibited twice, Lev. xix. 9, 10 and xxiii. 22; the law 'Vex not the stranger,' is repeated three times, Ex. xxii. 21; xxiii. 9; Lev. xix. 33 (besides Deut. x. 18, 19); and on the other hand, it appears from the Prophets that things not expressly prohibited by the law, were still understood to be forbidden. Thus St. Basil instances Amos ii. 7; God by Amos speaks of it as very offensive to Him, 'A man and his father will go in unto the same maid to profane My Holy Name.' It is clearly not forbidden by God for the first time through Amos. He speaks of it as one of the offences which would bring down His judgments on Israel, and yet St. Basil says, 'that father and son should not use one concubine (*ἐραίρα*) is not written in these laws, and yet in the Prophet is thought worthy of the strongest censure.' And he adds, as a general principle, 'How many other sorts of impure passions, the teaching of devils has invented, but Holy Scripture is silent upon, not choosing to defile its own decency (*σεμνόν*) by the names of foul things, but has censured them under the general name of uncleanness, as also the Apostle Paul saith, "Fornication and all uncleanness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints": but including under the name of uncleanness the unmentionable doings of men and those of women, so that silence does not altogether give free license to voluptuaries.'

If other dreadful things are expressed, at least the sin Rom. i. 26 is

nowhere alluded to in the Old Testament; and what would be any one's idea of purity or any other virtue, if he limited himself to the bare letter of what is forbidden there? There are flagrant sins against purity, not forbidden by the letter of Holy Scripture.

With this I should hope the rest of St. Basil's argument (whether you tell the House of Commons that it is St. Basil or no) would work in well, that we do not know the grounds why one thing is inserted and another omitted in Holy Scripture; we do not know, except from Holy Scripture itself, what the then customs of the Egyptians and Canaanites were; that there is no more need to account for the omission than for that of the daughter: that there is an obvious reason why this special polygamy should be forbidden (the fear lest the precedent of Jacob should be abused), and since it was forbidden virtually in v. 16 there was no need to repeat it.

This seems to set the Old Testament more in harmony in that the sister-in-law and wife's sister are equally prohibited, and this polygamy over and above; and then the Talmudists may easily be thrown over, as those who may have kept *some* traditions truly, and yet, in the main, corrupted the word of God through them. I know not how it was that this argument of St. Basil was not in my mind; certainly, were I to give my evidence now, I should put this forward as the explanation of Lev. xviii. 18.

You mention a great difficulty as to the State. Certainly the more the State detaches itself from the Church of England, the greater the difficulty is on these subjects. For it has no guide but the Church; and if it rejects that, it must flounder endlessly. I see not what standard it can substitute. Some, I hear, feel that it is hard to affix State penalties to that which the Roman Church allows by dispensations. Practically, however, the Roman Catholic marriages of the wife's sister are among the lower orders who are not affected by laws as to property. They would take it as a concession, but do not want it.

But then, of course, Parliament cannot stop with this measure, but must take off the civil penalty from any marriage in which the Pope is thought to be able to or does dispense. And this is one invidious part of this Bill. They are trying to get in the thin edge of the wedge. They appeal to other nations. Why then not propose to allow uncles to marry their nieces? Because, they know, the English would revolt at it at present. And yet there is not one word to be said, from Holy Scripture, the Church, habits of mankind, human instinct, for the one more than for the other. At least, what is done, let people do it with their eyes open, not hoodwinked.

However, what the State is to do when it casts off the guidance of the Church, and is to act upon some heathen principle, I know not what; some abstraction or ideal of its own. and to have education theories, &c., of its own, is no concern of mine. But I do wish that the State would deal openly with the Church. It is hard enough for the Church

to learn to act for itself, when for so long the State has bound her hand and foot, at first following her and adopting what she taught, and for the last century legislating for her, and now, it seems likely to be, against her. It is sad to see the fruits of this state of things in Archdeacon Hale, who by 'law' means 'Civil, State, Act of Parliament law,' and does not seem to have given a thought to the law of the Church. (Evidence.) If the State withdraws its prohibitions, at least let it leave to the Church to act for herself, whereas Mr. Stuart Wortley says, 'What the State proclaims lawful is lawful, and therefore no Clerk shall be punishable for breaking Ecclesiastical laws, because they are no longer laws of the State,' which is a direct interference with the constitution of the Church.

I see, with regret, each link of the old system broken, both with regard to the State and to the Church; to the State, because it is dropping the relation on which our prayers for Parliament are founded, and assuming a nondescript character which will in the end be infidel; and to the Church, because having been so long forbidden in any way to act for herself, she is disabled from doing so now, through long disuse.

I shall be very thankful to see this Bill thrown out, because it will imply a strong moral feeling on a question which is at the centre of all morals and our whole domestic life.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. P.

CHAPTER VIII.

HAYLING ISLAND—VOCATIONS TO A SINGLE LIFE—PARK VILLAGE—MISS SELLON—FOUNDATION OF THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY—THE BISHOP OF EXETER'S INQUIRY—THE CHOLERA AT DEVONPORT.

1847-1849.

THE summer vacations of 1847 and 1848 were spent by Pusey at Hayling Island, to which he was attracted by the quiet of the place and the sympathy of a neighbouring clergyman, the Rev. E. T. Richards, Vicar of Farlington, whom he very highly esteemed. He had with him his son Philip and his little daughter Mary; and Charles Marriott spent part of the time in 1847 as a visitor. They lodged at a house in the Crescent; and Pusey used to express his delight in the 'quiet beach where he could walk without his hat, and without the fear of being interrupted by strangers.' Later on Sister Mary, of the Park Village community, joined them; as did Mr. and Mrs. Crawley, of Littlemore.

'People in the neighbourhood,' writes Mrs. G. Huntingford, a daughter of Mr. Richards, who was there at the time, 'looked upon Dr. Pusey as a kind of strange being. His life there was a sort of mystery to the worldly-wise. He avoided society and was occupied with his own work, except when engaged with those who came to him for advice.'

Besides his family and Mr. Marriott, there were some ladies staying in the house, combining a stay by the seaside with the opportunity of obtaining help to their religious life. Pusey always said the daily morning and evening service with those who were staying in the house, and who

were willing to attend, as well as the day hours, from Prime to Compline.

‘Many people,’ continues Mrs. Huntingford, ‘used to come and go : it was a busy time, and yet a time of recreation. There was a certain awe of Dr. Pusey, which prevented his seeing some people in their everyday behaviour : but we were very merry at times. Little children were more at home with him than the rest of the world.’

The house was constantly brightened by the presence of the younger members of Mr. Richards’ family.

‘Dr. Pusey,’ says Mrs. Huntingford, ‘took a great deal of notice of them, and one of the boys asked him one day to tell them a story. He agreed ; and taking down the beautiful print of the “Good Shepherd” gathered us all round him, and with his arm round one little fellow, and another on his knee, drew out the story of the poor lost sheep and the Good Shepherd in such language as the little ones could well understand, and with many a word of help for the elder children around, whose little troubles he knew a good deal about.’

He preached in the Parish Church on almost every Sunday evening during his visits¹ ; and on St. Bartholomew’s Day, 1848, when the collection after the sermon assisted the Vicar to repair South Hayling Church, and especially to restore the ancient font.

It was amongst such peaceful and prayerful surroundings that Pusey was beginning to feel more and more deeply the pressure of those anxious questions necessarily involved in the revival of Sisterhood life. Probably he had hardly realized the gravity and intricacy of those questions—questions often involving delicate family relations—which he would be called upon to settle, nor the force of prejudice that the Religious life would not unnaturally excite, nor the difficulty of guiding and restraining the emotional and sensitive characters with whom he would be brought in contact. It must be remembered that in England and in English families, with the exception of the limited circle of the older Roman Catholics, there had been for centuries literally no experience of the Religious life. The special

¹ One sermon preached in Hayling Island Church is the beautiful sermon—full of experiences drawn from

his own life,—on Hope : ‘Parochial Sermons,’ vol. ii. p. 22.

vocation of a Sister of Mercy, the character involved and the claims of such a character, were altogether unknown. It was indeed rare that Christian parents had been called on to surrender a son to the missionary cause. The devotion of such a man as Bishop Selwyn the elder, whereby he was led to surrender a 'good career' as a clergyman at home, was regarded even by some estimable Bishops as quite 'inexplicable.' That young ladies who were considered 'serious' should object to theatres and dancing was looked upon as a pardonable eccentricity. But that those who were not 'Evangelical' should take a stricter view of life, should shrink from 'society,' and entertain thoughts of a vow of celibacy in face of an eligible marriage, was almost inconceivable. Besides, there was then generally, especially amongst religious-minded people, a very high and right sense of filial obligation; there was also the notorious jealousy of interference on the part of a spiritual guide in the private arrangements of family life.

With his unworldliness and simplicity, with his overwhelming sense of Divine guidance, the sanctity of the human soul, and the nothingness of all worldly objects and aims, Pusey found himself, almost before he was aware of it, opposed to the wishes and judgments of respected friends, and sometimes thwarting the most cherished aims which they entertained for their children. Again, his small knowledge of the outer world and his own disciplined disposition were not the best qualifications for gauging any excitable and emotional temperaments with which he might have to deal. And in these delicate relations, which a gainsaying and censorious world could not rightly appreciate, he laid himself open to misconceptions and gossip against which a man more worldly-wise would have been on his guard. Hence it is very far indeed from being a matter for surprise that at the time, and indeed for years after, Pusey became the subject of all sorts of imputations and charges, the result of excited religious animosity acting upon and exaggerating imperfect information. It is easy,

without entering into any details, to understand the direction which these cruel suspicions, arising out of the necessarily close relations existing between a spiritual guide and those whom he guided, would be likely to take.

In one direction, however, the gossip went so far that Mr. Keble thought it good that Pusey should be made aware of the manner in which his conduct was being misinterpreted. After alluding to the report which caused him to write—namely, that he administered the Holy Communion daily to a Sister without any one being present—Keble expresses his fear lest his friend should ‘unwittingly give some ἀφορμὴ of reproachful speech or thought,’ whilst he ‘was very likely before God doing the very work of angels.’

June 8, 1849.

‘Do, my dear friend, forgive me for saying this. I know by sad experience how necessary the rules are which commonly regulate this kind of intercourse—necessary, I mean, for the generality of persons—and does it not seem therefore a part of charity for *those* to keep them up for others’ sake, who on their own account might not need them? . . . I am sure you do not forget that your work is ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς, and it would be a thousand pities if it were damaged for want of a little caution on this head.’

In reply Pusey, besides contradicting the rumour about his having administered the Holy Sacrament to one person alone, submitted the whole facts of the case unreservedly to Keble’s judgment. The gossip soon died away, only to be revived from time to time to the great annoyance of Pusey’s friends. In his simplicity, Pusey himself was as unconscious of the gossip as he was regardless of the means to avoid it. The fact is, as Keble suggests, that he was so centred on the great spiritual effort on which his heart was set, that he was too little careful of social conventionalities, the observance of which would have prevented these misinterpretations of his conduct and relieved his friends of the pain which he could not understand that he was causing them.

Rarely however at any time did one of these exaggerated and distorted stories appear in a sufficiently definite form to

be dealt with according to its merits. The extent to which these stories might go is shewn by the fact that once when travelling unrecognized in a stage coach, he was confronted with the grotesque statement that it was his habit to sacrifice a lamb daily ; and it was with difficulty that he convinced his informant that the story was not founded on truth. But the visit to Hayling Island which has just been described gave occasion many years afterwards for one open charge which fortunately admitted of being thoroughly sifted. During a correspondence in *The Times* on the subject of Confession, the well-known S. G. O. had the hardihood to formulate a fully detailed and explicit accusation, which as a matter of fact referred to one of Pusey's young visitors at Hayling Island. It ran as follows :—

'A young lady some years since came under the influence of a Director or Confessor of the Church of England. He obtained a complete ascendancy over her. She before him took a vow of celibacy for two years, *unknown to her parents*. An offer of marriage was made to her, with their approval. There was no question of her marrying, until after the time of her vow should have expired. But even then, she had scruples, unless her director would give his sanction ; this, even when solicited by her parents, *he refused to do*. The result was, she remained single, and died so¹.'

The story was further decorated with other details about Pusey having enjoined the wearing of a particular dress, and separation from home and society, and about 'the weaving of meshes of priestcraft,' and the cruel disregard of parental authority. Happily for the sake of Pusey and of the truth, the young lady's father, whose friendship with Pusey had never been interrupted, was still alive. He wrote at once to *The Times*, giving an explicit denial to S. G. O.'s story. The real truth of the matter was, so the father stated, that Dr. Pusey had prevented his daughter from taking a life-long vow by allowing one for two years only ; and that when the two years were expired Dr. Pusey had nothing at all to do with the case. He further expressed his deep gratitude for Pusey's 'kind and valuable services' to his dear daughter.

¹ *The Times*, Dec. 20, 1866.

This charge is typical of many others which differ from it only in the fact that they were not sufficiently definite for refutation. Whatever opinions may be held as to the wisdom of Pusey's action and advice in difficult and delicate cases of this kind, every imputation of moral obliquity turned out to be absolutely groundless.

Akin to such anxieties and complications was Pusey's ever-increasing responsibility for the Sisterhood in Park Village, Regent's Park. In 1848, it had been in existence for the three years for which its support was at first guaranteed, and some of the laymen who had promoted the original foundation were not unreasonably anxious that it should be more distinctly sanctioned and controlled by the Bishop of London. Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope had a correspondence with the Bishop of London, and subsequently put himself into communication with Pusey. The Bishop, he urged, ought to know what rules were observed and what Devotions were used by the Sisters. The Devotions used in the private chapel were, as a matter of fact, taken from the Breviary: all invocations of saints, and even prayers for the faithful departed, being omitted. But 'the Breviary,' whether adapted or not, was a word which scared even sensible people, who probably knew little of its contents or of its relation to the English Prayer-book.

Pusey agreed that the rules should be submitted to the Bishop. They had already been revised in order to meet his wishes; but there would be no difficulty about further modifications. The Devotions, used in the chapel, could hardly be revised without being completely destroyed. No exception could be taken to them in detail, composed as they were of Holy Scripture and a few passages from the Fathers: while everything open to objection in its character had been omitted.

'I see no course,' wrote Pusey to Mr. Hope, 'except that of telling the Bishop what we have done, and upon what principle we did it, and how we thought that what we did was free from the objection which he made to "adaptations" in his Charge of 1842. . . . We had only done what the compilers of our Liturgy bore out.'

The Bishop returned the Sisters' rules to Mr. Hope, so Pusey informs Keble,

'saying that he saw nothing to object to, if wisely and judiciously carried out, and that he should say so to any who complained to him. This is a very great gain : before this he was very displeased with me, and even spoke, though he afterwards quite retracted it, as though I ought not to speak in his diocese. The ground of his displeasure is my little books.'

In another diocese an enterprise akin to that of the Park Village community was now obtaining more direct episcopal sanction. This was the work which was begun at Devonport by Miss Sellon.

Miss Sellon was the daughter of an officer in the Royal Navy, who had retired from the service and was living in Devonshire. She was on the point of leaving England for her health, when she saw the Bishop of Exeter's appeal of New Year's Day, 1848, for help to relieve the spiritual and moral destitution of the great seaport in his diocese, the population of which had altogether outgrown all existing provisions for religious teaching and worship. The Bishop asked for at least four large churches, for additions to the scanty endowments of the existing clergy, and not least for 'schools on an ample scale and in larger number.' It was this part of the Bishop's appeal which especially attracted Miss Sellon ; and she obtained her father's consent to offer herself to help in such work.

At the suggestion of some mutual friends in Oxford, Pusey, who had previously made Miss Sellon's acquaintance, sent her with a letter of introduction to Mr. Kilpack, the first incumbent of the Peel district of St. James', Devonport, which had been taken out of the parish of Stoke Damerel. It had a population of between 4,000 and 5,000, almost entirely of the labouring classes, and was without church and schools. Miss Sellon placed her services at the disposal of Mr. Kilpack : she and a friend who accompanied her were ready to teach in schools or to undertake any other kind of charitable work which might be wanted.

After they had brought some order and discipline into a school which had lately been started, Miss Sellon attempted a more difficult problem. This was to form a free industrial school for girls and to organize a night school for boys from twelve to sixteen, who were employed in the Government works. Her success in these directions won the warm approbation of those who were best qualified to judge. These schools naturally led on to her undertaking in some measure the preparation of candidates for baptism and confirmation; for the clergy were too few to grapple with the many spiritual needs of the district. She also established a school for starving children and a Home for the orphan children of sailors. She interested herself also deeply in the case of the female emigrants on board vessels which touched at the port.

When she had been at work less than a year, Pusey, after visiting the scenes of her labours, writes to the Rev. E. Coleridge :—

‘Jan., 1849.

‘The works of mercy opened at Devonport . . . embrace the whole range of which our Blessed Lord speaks relatively to the Day of Judgment. There are thousands of little ones to receive in His Name and with them to receive Him; hungry and thirsty in whom to feed Him and give Him drink; strangers in whom to take Him in; sick in whom to visit Him.

‘But, in detail. There are for the morning, besides the Infant School, three schools to visit and superintend; there is an opening already for two other schools in the very worst part of Devonport, where a paid mistress could hardly be sent, and there are no more funds to provide one, if she could: there is this Industrial School to be opened, which may well occupy the whole time of two persons; and of these, one must have no common energy and resources to interest and instruct perhaps 100 children or young women, while engaged busily in working with their hands for their livelihood. For every evening in the week there is either the class of young women to be prepared for Confirmation and otherwise taught, or the boys’ school, which lasts from 7.30 sometimes until 10. Besides this, there are the poor orphans to be gathered in, and continually tended and taught, and carefully watched too (just as a parent’s eye is over a child, though it perceives it not) lest, before they have unlearned their evil and learnt good, any should teach another the evil it may have learnt, or they should keep up in one another the memory of evil from which they are now sheltered. And most of what is now begun may be multi-

plied well-nigh a thousandfold. For who is to teach the 5,242 children in Devonport, where there are no local funds? Then, there lies beyond, the visiting of the female emigrants, where a few hours' work may be the means, in God's Hands, of [promoting] an orderly and Christian mode of life during months of their voyage, in which they have no one to take care of their souls. There is the multiplied visiting of sick, starving, fevered, dying, recovering, poor; all ignorant, all neglected except by the clergy, who ought themselves to be many more (for what are seven clergy among 40,000 souls?).'

Such enterprises required many workers, an organization of work, and above all a temper and rule of life which would make a high and self-denying standard of effort natural and easy. Earnest Christian women were offering to give their help: but without some rule and order their strength and gifts would only be wasted.

'One woman,' wrote Pusey to the Rev. E. Coleridge, 'is a good teacher of children, another has a good method of arranging their employments or forming their moral habits; one can teach classes well, another speak to them individually, another superintend work or household duties; another has a quick eye in nursing the sick or dying, to see what will best relieve them; another understands how to relieve poverty. Everything is carried on best by co-operation, each supplying what God has given to each. And then too, supposing other unmarried ladies, into whose heart God should put it to help these poor forsaken ones, to obtain leave to come and help, was each, her day's work done, to return to her lonely lodgings, without sympathy amid difficulty or temporary failure of hopes? Was all to be done in a broken disjointed way?'

This question was soon answered, and in the best way. The Bishop of Exeter came to Devonport for a Confirmation, and after seeing the work, gave his hearty sanction to the establishment of a community of Sisters of Mercy to carry it on. This indeed was the origin of the Sisterhood afterwards known as the Devonport Society. Its rules were simple, and the Bishop became the official visitor. The outward badge of membership was a plain black dress, with a black cross. Of this Pusey wrote:—

'When our ladies may wear crosses of diamonds or rubies in ball-rooms or at dinner-parties, who will grudge these Christian women their black wooden Cross, to assure the poor people that their visitors are not come curiously to pry into their distress, but on their Saviour's message of love, or to awe the bad?'

The success at Devonport appeared to Pusey one more token of God's presence in and favour towards the English Church. He wrote of it in the following terms:—

‘It has been so wholly God's work of love for the salvation of these neglected souls. It has been, you know, my comfort these fifteen years, that the great work which has been going on throughout the English Church, in the revival of forgotten truths and greater earnestness and love and deeper reverence, could not be traced or attributed to any individuals. It was far beyond the work of man. And now in this work which has been called by a clergyman “the regeneration of Devonport,” the results have been so far beyond the means employed, the change so great, so blessed, so instantaneous; what would have been a blessed fruit of years, has been the work of months. One can only say again and again, what one has said often these fifteen years, “This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.” It is a common saying, “Morice Town in November is quite different from Morice Town in April.” The same bad words are not heard in the streets; the very value of houses is increased, because they are more respectable. One said earnestly, “I speak plainly; I know Morice Town well; I have been over it carefully this morning; it is so changed that I would not say one word against the place, for fear I should be fighting against God.” It does make one's eyes fill with tears of thankfulness, to think how good and loving God has been in this great work of love for their souls, and how many besides may yet be rescued out of this wasting mass. I cannot think or speak of it without tears coming to my eyes.’

The Sisterhood at Devonport was at first patronized by distinguished persons, notably by the Queen Dowager. Royalty, however, is always and necessarily much at the mercy of second-hand informers; and a person who had visited Devonport and, without calling on Miss Sellon, had consulted with one of her well-known and avowed opponents, persuaded the Queen to withdraw her countenance, which, amidst the confusing voices of subsequent controversy, she of course was unable again to grant.

So good a work as that begun by the Sisters at Plymouth was not likely to be allowed to go forward without interruption. The attack was in the main directed against the new district church of St. Peter's, Eldad, the incumbent of which, the Rev. G. R. Prynne, laboured with singular devotion and charity among the poor around him. He was charged with such practices as chanting the Litany, bowing at

the Name of Jesus, turning towards the east at certain portions of the service, omitting prayer before the sermon, preaching in the surplice, using the Offertory Sentences and prayer for the Church Militant, collecting the alms of the congregation in alms-bags of velvet, and then 'laying them on the altar with kneeling and prayer.' The Bishop of Exeter was appealed to; but his reply only strengthened Mr. Prynne's hands. The remaining resource was an indignation meeting; at which everything was said that, in the opinion of the conveners, the Bishop ought to have said and did not say. It was inevitable that the Sisterhood should come in for their share of denunciations; and the Low Church Vicar of St. Andrew's, a local solicitor, and the editors of two local papers, contrived to extract from three poor girls, who had been inmates of the Orphans' Home, such information with respect to the private and devotional habits of the Sisters as might produce an inflammatory effect on the imaginations of the less religious or less instructed people. The Sisters bowed to the cross. They said 'lauds' in the 'oratory.' They called Dr. Pusey 'father.' Dr. Pusey 'administered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper every day in the chapel when he was at the Home, and once in a small dormitory where a Sister was ill.' The Sisters wore crosses. They would not allow discussion of matters that went on in the house. 'Friday and Wednesday were called festival days and no work was done on them.' These and other 'charges' equally false or equally foolish were the staple of the indictment.

Bishop Phillpotts was only seriously concerned about one point. He was before all things for maintaining the law of Church and State, and the charges implied that Pusey had administered the Holy Communion in an unconsecrated building, and without a licence, to persons who might have attended their parish church.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

Bishopstowe, Feb. 12, 1849.

This is a most unfortunate case. The course I have taken on other occasions is that of enforcing Discipline, the general relaxation of

which has been the bane of our Church. I should be wanting in candour to you if I did not frankly avow that a grave irregularity seems to me to have been committed by you; and if, on full inquiry, I shall find this to have been the case, you are the last person who would think me wrong in vindicating discipline.

I am very much annoyed by the matter.

Many thanks for your kind intention to send me your paper on the question on which I wrote to you.

Believe me, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

Rev. Dr. Pusey.

H. EXETER.

P.S. The statements in the Plymouth newspaper are of such a kind as make me deem it necessary to hold an inquiry on the spot on Thursday next, at 11.30 a.m. The matter, which concerns your name, may probably be stated: therefore, if you think proper, you may address a letter to Miss Sellon, or any one else, containing any statement of particulars which you would wish to be adduced. The inquiry will *not* be *private*.

On the following day Pusey received a letter to the same effect from the Bishop of Exeter's chaplain, the Rev. W. Maskell, who 'hoped that Miss Sellon might be wise enough to give up what was unessential, and firm enough to retain, at whatever loss, all that is essential to the working of a Sisterhood of Mercy.'

The inquiry was held on Thursday, Feb. 15, 1849, in the Mechanics' Institute at Devonport. It was conducted by the Bishop in person. The Bishop examined the children from whom the evidence had been obtained, and soon reduced their statements to the standard of sober fact. It appeared that the Holy Communion had not been administered by Pusey or anybody else except for the sake of sick persons; only one of these in the oratory; and all with the permission of the Vicar of the parish. When one of the girls referred to Dr. Pusey's visits to the Home, the Bishop observed that

'there could not be a just prejudice entertained on the ground of the visit of Dr. Pusey to the Orphans' Home. Not,' he added, 'that I do not know that nineteen possibly out of every twenty in this room couple criminality with the name of that clergyman. I should be ashamed if I did not avow openly that the acquaintance with that gentleman is not in the least discreditable to any of them, and that these ladies are honoured to have him for a friend, and they have a right to enjoy his friendship.'

This avowal elicited many hisses and some cheers. The inquiry into the private communions in the chapel led the Bishop to observe that he knew Mr. Philip Edward Pusey, who had been with his father at Devonport, to be an invalid; that he had been brought to him for the purpose of receiving a Bishop's blessing; and, he added, 'I thank God that I was enabled to give it, because I saw that it gave to him and to his venerable father real comfort.' After examining Miss Sellon, in public, he allowed her to read a long written defence of the work and life in the Sisterhood. He then pronounced his judgment. 'He could not profess to have approached the subject with entire impartiality. He came with a feeling of veneration for Miss Sellon's work and character. He went away with a feeling that he could not express—of admiration and reverence—of unmixed admiration. He could wish that the cross and flowers had not been placed on the altar in the oratory. But ladies were ladies. If the irregularities were strange, they were by no means so strange as the works of mercy the Sisters had performed. Miss Sellon might leave that room with the gratitude and approbation of all those whose good opinion she would value.'

Mr. Dyke Acland, who had been present, sent Pusey an enthusiastic report of the proceedings.

'The Bishop,' he wrote on Feb. 16, 1849, 'spoke as boldly with regard to you in public as he had done to me warmly in private, perfectly fearless of any reproach it might bring upon himself; he spoke of her intimacy with you as one of which he felt, however the public might choose to cast opprobrium upon it, was in his opinion an honour to any one. The day was a wonderful one—I should think altogether unseen in our times. It was a great privilege to serve her anyhow. Surely the prayers of many were heard; and those who withstand what is good must have gone away ashamed.'

Pusey was not at this time accustomed to experience much kindly treatment at the hands of Bishops, and he was filled with thankfulness and joy at the courage and decision of the Bishop of Exeter. 'Everything,' he wrote to Keble, 'is most blessedly over at Devonport. The

Bishop has done nobly. Hearts won to the Sisterhood. You will see details in the papers. Thanks be to God.'

The Bishop had hinted in his judgment that Miss Sellon was doing too much: and her exertions, followed by the strain and excitement of a public trial, led the way, naturally enough, to an illness. Shortly after Easter, Pusey wrote to Keble:—

'I must go to Devonport at Whitsuntide, as Miss Sellon is in a state balancing between life and death. If these prostrating attacks of pain are removed, she may still serve God here by His mercy. If they continue, she will at last fall into consumption. You will pray for her, for she seems to have a work given her to do.'

After a short time Miss Sellon came to Oxford, where she would be able to secure rest, and would find companionship in Miss Mary Pusey and her governess. This visit to Oxford gave occasion to some of those gossiping rumours which, however baseless and absurd, were, as has already been said, too widely circulated by the tongue of scandal to be ignored by Pusey's friends.

On her return, however, to Devonport Miss Sellon found a noble opportunity of silencing her critics, whether in the streets of Plymouth or in the Common-rooms of Oxford. On June 5, 1849, a case of cholera was discovered on board an emigrant vessel in the port of Plymouth. The terrible scourge rapidly spread, and especially in the crowded streets and alleys of Devonport. The small band of Sisters immediately devoted themselves with great energy to the care of the sufferers, and won all hearts by their self-forgetting labours.

'The Sisters,' wrote the Rev. G. R. Prynne, 'were not living in my parish at the time, and when the cholera broke out with deadly violence, I had a visit from Miss Sellon one evening. "I am come," she said, "to ask if you will accept the services of myself and Sisters to visit the sick and dying in your parish." A distrustful thought crossed me. Shall I bring these devoted ladies from another parish, I thought, to such scenes and such danger? I must have hesitated, and said some words to this effect. "You must not look upon us as mere ladies," said Miss Sellon, "but as Sisters of Mercy; and the proper place for Sisters of Mercy is amongst the sick and dying; if you refuse our aid, we must offer it elsewhere." "I will not refuse,"

I replied: "come with me." And together we went, accompanied by Mr. Hetling, into the very worst of it. From that night their work began and abated not, until, through God's mercy, the sickness itself did ¹.

Mr. Prynne's curate, the Rev. G. H. Hetling, in his report to the Bishop of Exeter, concludes his eloquent and detailed account as follows:—

'It has been my lot in life for one quarter of a century to have seen, and borne an active part in, very much of suffering, pain, and death. Formerly, in medical practice, I have seen the whole course of cholera in London, Paris, and Bristol, and lastly here in my office of deacon. I have beheld many acts of self-devotion to its sufferers and victims, yet never have I witnessed anything that surpassed, or even equalled, the self-abandonment and self-sacrifice of these humble Sisters. . . . Miss Sellon (who, though ill, has been on the spot every day) and her fellow-workers may justly be added to the list of female heroines. In this opinion persons of all views coincide, and they who formerly opposed them cannot now withhold the meed of praise. Truly one more reason may be deduced from such visitations for the establishment of Sisterhoods, for in what other manner could such effectual assistance have been secured?'

¹ Appendix (pp. 16, 17) to 'Letter to Miss Sellon,' by Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter. London, Murray, 1852.

CHAPTER IX.

THE GORHAM CASE---THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY.

1847-1850.

FROM these scenes of spiritual growth and self-devotion, it is now necessary to turn to the great doctrinal discussion which, in its manifold results, was more fruitful in anxiety and loss to the Church of England than even the events of 1845. On Nov. 2, 1847, the Rev. G. C. Gorham, Vicar of St. Just-in-Penwith, Cornwall, was presented by the Crown to the vicarage of Brampford Speke. Both benefices were at that time in the Diocese of Exeter; and Bishop Phillpotts had reason from a recent correspondence to think that the opinions of Mr. Gorham with regard to Baptismal Regeneration were unsound and incompatible with the formularies of the Church. He was therefore reluctant to institute him to another cure of souls within his own jurisdiction. Consequently when Mr. Gorham applied for institution to his new benefice, the Bishop, on Nov. 13, informed him that, before complying with his request, it would be necessary to ascertain by examination whether he was sound in Christian doctrine. In December, 1847, and March, 1848, the Bishop held an examination of Mr. Gorham, which lasted altogether for eight days. As a result he was confirmed in his suspicions of unsound doctrine. Mr. Gorham, in fact, though accepting all the formularies of the Church, did so in a Calvinistic sense. He understood Mr. Gorham's position to be that it is not in Baptism that spiritual regeneration is given or conferred; in particular that infants are not made therein members of

Christ and the children of God. Accordingly he refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the living of Brampford Speke.

On June 15, 1848, at the instance of Mr. Gorham, a monition was issued from the Arches Court of Canterbury, directing the Bishop of Exeter either to institute Mr. Gorham, or to show cause why he should not do so. The case was argued at length in January and in June, 1849, and on August 2 of that year Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, the Dean of the Arches, gave judgment that the Church of England held the doctrine of the spiritual regeneration of infants in the sacrament of Baptism, and that Mr. Gorham 'did oppose this article' of the teaching of the Church, and that the Bishop of Exeter had shown sufficient reason for not instituting Mr. Gorham to the living of Brampford Speke.

Mr. Gorham appealed from the Arches Court of Canterbury to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which in 1833 had, by a well-known oversight, been constituted the supreme court of appeal in all ecclesiastical cases.

It was at once seen that there was ground for grave anxiety on the part of Churchmen as to what might be the result of this appeal. An essential doctrine of the Church was in question ; and the constitution of a civil court gave no security for an adequate spiritual judgment. Moreover the position assumed by the Supreme Court of Appeal raised the whole question of what was involved in the Royal Supremacy. So far as the doctrine held by Mr. Gorham was concerned, the formularies of the Church seemed indeed to be explicit enough. But it must be remembered, on his behalf, that they had at least been accepted in varying senses from the sixteenth century, and not always in accordance with the High Church view. Still the fact remained that Mr. Gorham seemed to be contradicting the true and literal sense of the formularies, and to be justifying his position under shelter of the law.

What the opinions of Mr. Gorham really were, it is perhaps unnecessary to attempt to define. But it may be convenient to state here, as explanatory of the whole position, what in the sequel were held by the Final Court

of Appeal to be the doctrines advanced by him. In the final decision on the matter by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the judges stated : ' The doctrine held by Mr. Gorham appears to us to be this—that Baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of Baptism that regeneration invariably takes place in Baptism ; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after Baptism ; that Baptism is an effectual sign of grace. by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it—in them alone it has a wholesome effect ; and that, without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace ; that infants baptized and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved ; but that in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional.' It is unnecessary to point out that the statements censured by the Bishop, and the positions of Mr. Gorham as defined by the Privy Council, are by no means identical. In order to understand the history, it seemed necessary to state this fact in anticipation.

As was inevitable, Pusey had closely followed the case from the first. His own earlier writings, notably his Tracts on Baptism, would have alone rendered him specially interested in any controversy dealing with the initial Sacrament. He at once set himself to work to reprint the third of the Tracts on Baptism which he had published in 1835 ; but he could not get it ready in time for the trial before the Judicial Committee. He foresaw also that this case might have the effect of laying a new emphasis on the authority of the Crown in controlling the spiritual affairs of the Church of England. The recent incidents at Bow Church in connexion with the confirmation of Dr. Hampden's appointment to the See of Hereford had caused many to fear that the Crown could at pleasure advance to the dignity of the Episcopate a clergyman whose doctrine was seriously questioned. Might not the Gorham case shew that the Crown could mould the doctrines of the Church as well as appoint her rulers? Might it not under the guise of

giving, in a civil court from which there was no appeal, the legal interpretation of Church formularies, affect the claims and position of the Church of England as a teacher of primitive truth? The Gorham case had already begun before the Hampden case was decided; and there can be no doubt that these were the two main causes of the second wave of secessions to the Church of Rome.

Those whose minds were, for whatever reason, already looking towards Rome, were not sorry that matters should be brought to a head at any cost. They felt a secret satisfaction at the thickening symptoms of difficulty and danger for the Church of England. Pusey, on the other hand, was pointing out that the shortcomings or misfortunes of the Church of England do not prove the claims or doctrines of the Church of Rome to be true or even tenable; and he held, moreover, that in the settlement of existing controversies, time was on the side of truth, and everything was to be gained by waiting. From the very first he could contemplate a decision of the Privy Council against the Bishop, without despair. Writing to Harrison as soon as Mr. Gorham's appeal from the decision of the Arches Court was announced, he says, 'A judicial decision on a doctrinal question, reversing an ecclesiastical judgment and deciding against the Creeds, would be a miserable thing, though one must, if God avert it not, make the best of it, and sit down by the waters of Babylon, toiling on under bondage.' He accordingly had regretted the decision of the Bishop of Exeter not to institute Mr. Gorham. He thought that Mr. Gorham might possibly have been won by kindness, but that he would only be exasperated by law. It was undeniable that the full doctrine of the Sacraments had been largely ignored if not denied by individuals in the Church; and the process of recovery of spiritual truth or health, after a long interval of disuse or error, is necessarily slow. But he was of course indisposed to criticize a prelate, whose courageous loyalty to unpopular truth was so deserving of respect. So the Gorham case followed its course until

it reached the Judicial Committee, before the Bishop of Exeter asked Pusey for assistance in defending his position. In a series of letters he then plied Pusey with various theological and liturgical questions, the answers to which involved a vast amount of study and labour. 'I am the more emboldened,' he says, 'to propose this trouble to you, because you will, I am confident, regard it as a contribution to the maintenance of Catholic truth on a fundamental Article.' As the hearing of the appeal approached, Pusey had also several interviews with Mr. Badeley in London, and contributed, as before in the Hampden case, abundant materials to his argument.

'Thank you,' wrote Mr. Badeley after the trial, 'again and again for all your valuable and impartial assistance. . . . I think I made the judges understand the *opus operatum*, and I gave them in substance what you had written about it.'

On December 11, 1849, the case came on for hearing before the Judicial Committee. The Court consisted of the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London, together with seven lay judges. Archbishop Howley had died in the midst of the Hampden trouble, and on the recommendation of Lord John Russell, Dr. J. B. Sumner had succeeded him. It was unfortunate that both he and the Archbishop of York should have already in some measure committed themselves before the matter came before them judicially; the Archbishop of York had dealt with the matter in his Charge, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, in a recent republication of an earlier treatise, had prefixed to it a preface dealing with the controversy. The hopes of Churchmen could only be fixed upon what Dr. Blomfield, the Bishop of London, might be able to accomplish.

More than two months elapsed between the hearing of the case and the delivery of the Judgment. It was a time of very great anxiety. As soon as the pleadings were over, Mr. Badeley expresses his fears in a letter to Pusey.

E. BADELEY, ESQ., TO E. B. P.

Dec. 24, 1849.

What is to be done if the Privy Council decide wrongly? Robert Wilberforce asks this in a letter of Saturday, and suggests that some

move should be thought of in Convocation, to repudiate their decision on behalf of the Church. But this will be difficult. I shall be glad if you will consider this, for it is most important; and we ought to be prepared for the worst.'

In a second letter (Dec. 27) Mr. Badeley writes:—

'In spite of what Keble says, I fear that a great many will be unsettled if the judgment is against us, and will consider this a signal for their quitting the English Church, unless some effort is made on the part of the Church to repudiate the decision and upset the tribunal itself.'

Mr. Badeley's anxiety was not without justification. For instance, Archdeacon Manning had already entered on that line of thought which led to his joining the Church of Rome. Pusey again found himself, as six years before, shewing all the sympathy he possibly could with a friend whom his own convictions would not allow him to follow. But on this occasion he is able, and careful, to state the exact limits of his convictions more definitely than he did to Newman. The Archdeacon had apparently asked Pusey whether he could accept the Decrees of the Council of Trent.

E. B. P. TO ARCHDEACON MANNING.

MY DEAREST FRIEND, Asherne, Dartmouth [Dec. 1849].

. . . Whether what was done at the Reformation was the wisest or best thing, whether we have since suffered from things which were done or left undone, is not I suppose the question, but whether what we did was a formal act of schism. One might say, whether the extremity of the case did not bear out the reforming by ourselves. Certainly the Council of Trent itself admits a great extent of previous abuse.

It is to me a great comfort that the Council of Trent did not define more than it did, but still, if, as an English Churchman, one may so speak, it does seem to have been too justificative¹. I suppose the sale of Indulgences in Germany, Holland, and Switzerland was exceedingly profligate. It seems to have occasioned the schism in all. Yet the Council of Trent maintains Indulgences broadly without defining them, as ever having been in the Church. Thus, as far as the letter goes, the Council of Trent is not committed to anything [as to the effect of Indulgences] beyond this life. In truth, according to its words, they [i. e. the effects of Indulgences] ought to be restrained to this life. Yet they are not in the practical system.

¹ [i. e. disposed to defend existing errors and abuses.]

I should then on this and other grounds be dishonest, if I signed the Council of Trent with the practical comment put upon it. I can then hope well for the future, when, as I trust, the Churches of England and Rome may come to an understanding; and yet could not as an individual, on this and some other grounds, profess that I myself receive it.

It seems to me that we have been limiting in the one way; the Roman Church in the other: if both were to supply what we have omitted we might meet.

We have protested against Indulgences; they have maintained them, but not necessarily in the same sense.

They anathematize those who do not regard the Apocryphal books as Canonical; we keep St. Jerome's Canon, yet acting on it, act on a rule which they, if they explained themselves, might acknowledge.

They say that there are seven Sacraments, but anathematize those who say that they are all equal; we, with the Ancient Church, separate off the two great Sacraments which flowed from our Lord's side; but only say of the rest that they have not the like nature of Sacraments. The 'corrupt following of the Apostles' clearly belongs to the then common practice of not administering it [i.e. Extreme Unction] until there should be no human likelihood that he [i.e. the sick person] could recover, so that what is in Holy Scripture for recovery, *was* administered only when there was no hope of it.

F. of the Circumcision [1850].

Since writing the above, Badeley's pleadings took up much time (not but that he very well understood the subject), and the year has come to its close. All blessings be around you in that which has now dawned.

I have just been reading through again the Council of Trent.

What I felt before comes out fully to me again, on reading it as a whole, that it is so manifestly not directed against us. Indeed, as you know well historically, it was taken up with the errors of Luther chiefly. There are his very words. But I mean, reading it through as a whole, it is so very plain that it had not us in its mind.

Still I have two great classes of difficulties as to the Council of Trent.

1. If I had been born a Roman Catholic, I suppose that I should have committed all difficulties to God, and received on the authority of the Church, and shutting my eyes, what I did not understand. As it is, not owing allegiance to the Church of Rome, I cannot receive *on authority* what does not come to me on the authority of the whole Church. But since I cannot do this, it is to me an abstract question. I am not called upon to submit; and yet there are statements in it, which I could only receive in the most implicit submission, shutting my eyes and my understanding. For the Council of Trent goes, not on what dear Newman goes, Development, but on Apostolic tradition, and that in its very strict sense, 'quae ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per

manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerunt¹.' Now, in no sense, I suppose, could the doctrine as to Indulgences, Invocation, Purgatory, be so called.

I had hoped to finish this last night, but was too tired, and am to set off this morning for the rest of the week, but I hope to write again soon. This is to convey to you all wishes for this year from the Father of Mercies and the God of all comfort.

My other difficulty about the Council of Trent would be, that some of its Articles I could not take in the sense in which they are popularly taken, unless I were to resign my own understanding, which, of course, one should to the Church.

And so this it is, on which all turns. I could not subscribe the Council of Trent (as now interpreted), for for this it matters not whether the Articles are more or fewer which I could not so sign—except on the belief that the Roman Church alone were the Church of Christ. And I can see no ground to anathematize the Russian Greek Church as well as our own. The claim several times made parenthetically in the Council of Trent, to be '*mater omnium et magistra*,' is surely unhistoric, in the way in which it now advances, claiming to appoint all patriarchs, &c. Guéranger says [writes] to the effect that there will be no unity until the Roman Missal be adopted in all lands; to the exclusion of the Greek. And now, without the consent of the Greeks, they are making a new Article of faith, and that out of Council. Alas! alas!

I should say that as to the Council of Trent, I feel a separate difficulty as to some of its anathemas. I could not, as an act of my own, anathematize those who do not hold what was not an article of faith as once for all delivered to the saints.

You know how I hate this word *I*. But I write as a member and priest of the English Church. I hope that the three Churches could come to a right understanding. As a member of the English Church, I am not resting on private judgment in not submitting to the Roman. Yet their very books of controversy invite one to private judgment: for why, as they do from Bellarmine [downwards], bring one passages from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, if one is not to weigh them? One might as well not have them at all. And when the passages of the Fathers are spurious, this makes things worse. And this is a further difficulty, that practices grew up through forgeries, as the Decretals and so many passages of the Fathers on which they rest.

My state of mind then is not to reject things, hoping that they may be explained; but I do not accept the Council of Trent, not being bound to do so, as a Code of Faith.

I must break off this unsatisfactorily, else I shall be too late.

May God be with you and you with Him this year and for ever.

Ever your affectionate friend,

E. B. P.

¹ Conc. Trid. Sess. iv. De Can. Scripturis.

In reply to this, Archdeacon Manning explained that his inquiry about the formularies of the Church of Rome was due to this difficulty. The Final Court of Appeal in the Church of England failed in his judgment to satisfy two essential laws, flowing from the principle that the sole absolute and ultimate tribunal and judge, both of doctrine and discipline, is the Church of Christ. These laws were, that this tribunal and judge must be (1) purely spiritual, and (2) within the Church. The Judicial Committee obviously fulfilled neither of these conditions. If this argument was sound, was it possible to continue allegiance to a supremacy, which involved such consequences?

Pusey thereupon answered as follows :—

E. B. P. TO ARCHDEACON MANNING.

Jan. 1850.

The sense in which I took the oath¹, and in which it was explained to me, was that it related to jurisdiction only, that the State was the ultimate administrator of justice. And this I see in Collyer, P. II. B. vi. p. 256, ed. 8, 433 fol., is the sense in which it was explained authoritatively by Q. Eliz. that she intended to stretch the regale no further than it was carried by K. Henry VIII. or K. Edw. VI., '*and was of ancient times due to the imperial crown of this realm*, i.e. under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these realms, dominions and countries, either ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power ought to have any superiority over them.'

The 'Act of Assurance,' ib. p. 358, 8vo, 481 fol., is entitled assurance of the Queen's power *over all estates* and pointed against the 'jurisdiction of the see of Rome,' and maintains 'the *ancient* jurisdiction over the *state* ecclesiastical,' and it says 'to ascertain the sense and *set forth the extent* of this solemn engagement, it is provided that the oath of supremacy made in the first year of this reign shall be taken and expounded in such form as is set forth in an admonition annexed to the Queen's Majesty's injunctions, published in the first year of H.M.'s reign, i.e. to confess and acknowledge in H.M., her heirs and successors none other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the noble King Henry VIII. and King Edw. VI., as in the said admonition more plainly may appear.'

Our consciences then are plainly clear; the sense in which we took the oath, is that recognized as the only sense by the authority which imposed the oath. If any attempt be made to stretch the power of any Court beyond the 'ancient jurisdiction of the temporal Sovereign,'

¹ i.e. of the supremacy of the Crown.

this would be a case of abuse or oppression, against which protests must be made and redress sought. But it does not affect our obligations. It may be a question whether any Court can exercise jurisdiction, without some interpretation of the laws which it enforces; e. g. were the question in the Church of Rome as to the denial of any prerogative attributed commonly to the B.V. it would be the question, whether it was included or no in the received formularies of the Roman Church. Yet such interpretation seems to be forbidden by the 1 Q. Eliz. c. 1 Supremacy Bill, that 'no persons shall be authorized by the Queen, her heirs or successors, to exercise any spiritual jurisdiction, shall have any authority or power to determine or judge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as had been heretofore determined, ordered or adjudged to be heresy by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, first four General Councils or any of them, or any other General Council wherein the same were declared heresy, &c., or such as should hereafter be adjudged to be heresy, by the High Court of Parliament *with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation*, anything in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding.'

It may be that the present constitution of the Court attempts to reconcile impossibilities, and that this case (for which I think I understood there has been no precedent) is meant to show it to us. But then this is a ground for the change of the constitution of the Court. The only question determined by the Act as to the Supremacy, is, that the Queen should in these realms be the supreme authority over all persons, that no causes should be carried to Rome or 'beyond seas,' as the Council of Carthage too forbade. But it does not determine of whom the ultimate Court should be composed. If it is found to involve 'the interpretation of doctrinal formularies,' and this to be 'equivalent to definition,' then according to that very Act it is more than was intended, for it is stated by whom heresy is to be defined, i. e. any new definition is to be made through Convocation, although having legal and penal authority through the State. Still the authority is ecclesiastical.

But, notwithstanding the tenor of the pleadings, I do not see as yet that the decision of the Privy Council need involve any principle at all. For clearness' sake, the doctrine of the Church of England was stated, but that doctrine is really notorious. We have no grounds as yet to think that the judgment of the Privy Council will even seem to determine this. If it should seem to go beyond the powers of a lay tribunal, then is the time for the Church to consider what is to be done. But I do not like to anticipate evils. I have assumed that by *within the Church and out of the Church*, you mean 'the spiritual authorities of the Church.'

Henry Wilberforce was also writing in the same sense as Archdeacon Manning. He dreaded a favourable decision on the part of the Judicial Committee more than

an heretical one; the latter might lead to resistance to the secular Court; the former might tempt Churchmen to overlook the real character of the Court, in their satisfaction at its action.

Pusey felt the pressure of this new and anxious aspect of the case. It was important to know what were the functions of the Final Court of Appeal. Did it only elucidate the legal sense of documents? Or were *bonâ fide* doctrinal decisions, as to matters left more or less undecided by the Church, inseparable from such elucidation?

E. B. P. TO MR. JUSTICE COLERIDGE.

Jan. 9, 1850.

This is clear to me, as I have put in the enclosed¹ paper, (1) that the same authority which imposes upon us the oath of supremacy, and gives the Queen power to judge in ecclesiastical causes, forbids any one, acting under those powers, to declare anything to be heresy which has not already been so declared, or shall hereafter be declared by Parliament *with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation*.

(2) It plainly follows that it was not intended to give any judicial body the power to settle what is the doctrine of the Church of England, i.e. to make or pronounce that to be her true doctrine or not her doctrine, which was not already acknowledged or denied to be her doctrine. For to pronounce anything for the first time to be false doctrine is to pronounce that to be heresy, which had not been so pronounced before, which is a power denied to any judicial body acting under that Act of Parliament.

(3) The Acts all speak of 'the ancient jurisdiction of the temporal Sovereign.' But the definition of heresy never was left to the temporal Sovereign. It is the *jurisdiction* only of the Pope which is denied, and the jurisdiction of the temporal Sovereign which is enforced.

By this, I understand, that if any person is wronged, or conceives himself wronged, it is meant that the cause should be righted within these realms and that by the temporal Sovereign. I do not know what the 'ancient jurisdiction' was; but clearly, in no 'ancient jurisdiction' could any power but the Church itself determine anything to be heresy, which was not previously so determined.

We are then (I am satisfied) clear as to our oaths. The question is (1) whether this delegation of judgment in cases of heresy to laymen is not incompatible with the prohibition that anything should be determined to be heresy without Convocation?

(2) If this exercise of jurisdiction does, of necessity, involve the power of determining doctrine to be heresy, or not to be heresy, are

¹ The extract from letter to Archdeacon Manning, as given above.

we not giving up a prerogative of the whole Church into the hands of certain persons appointed by H. M.'s Prime Minister, anyhow to the Civil Power?

The case of Mr. Gorham may be one of these cases. He clearly denies that original sin is remitted in Baptism. He holds, that if infants have the 'prævenient' grace' given to them, original sin is remitted to them thereupon, antecedently to Baptism; otherwise, he holds that original sin disqualifies an infant from receiving Baptism rightly. The Nicene Creed declares that 'there is one Baptism for the remission of sins'; a General Council (one of Carthage received by the whole Church) declared that, consequently, all infants had original sin, and that that sin was by Baptism remitted, and pronounced 'anathema' on those who denied it. Mr. Gorham's teaching then is clearly heretical.

Now if the Judicial Committee were simply to say, 'This doctrine has been declared heresy by a General Council, by the plain express words of the Canonical Scriptures,' this would be acting in conformity with the 1 Q. Eliz. c. 1. But instead of this, the whole tenor of the pleadings went on the supposition that they were to adjudge what is and what is not the doctrine of the Church of England. On one side, it was done on a sudden pressure, as men act in a fire, without having time to think how or in what way it must be put out. The immediate pressure was, lest a Supreme Court should deny true doctrine to be the doctrine of the Church. It was only afterwards that one could think at leisure of the other evil, whether the whole proceedings were not radically wrong. In fact, a right decision may be worse than [a] wrong. A wrong decision might rouse people to oppose the whole system. A right decision as to doctrine might induce them to acquiesce in a wrong principle, which might issue in most disastrous consequences. If the Judicial Committee may decide whether or no Baptismal Regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, it might determine whether such or such a theory of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture is so, &c., &c. Now the question in my mind, upon which I wished to consult you, is, whether the office of a Judge does not necessarily, in some cases, involve the new interpretation of those authorities upon which he founds his judgments? For if this be so, then he, in fact, by his judgment, limits or enlarges (as it may be) the meaning of those authorities. And if so, then, in matters of faith, a Judge would be, by so determining, in fact, declaring that to be heresy, which was not before so declared, contrary to the provisions of the very Act under which he judges, and encroaching on the authority of the Church.

Even as to the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, not only are not its nature and limits defined, but being assumed, it is not stated either in the Creeds or Articles. The Nicene Creed asserts that the 'Holy Ghost spake by the Prophets'; it implies their authority, 'according to the Scriptures.' The Articles declare what Scriptures are

'canonical'; and that what is proved thereby is to be believed. But this is very far short, of course, of what the whole Church has ever believed as to the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

Now if the Privy Council may decide as to Baptismal Regeneration of all infants, which has been ruled by the whole Church, why should it not as to cases hitherto undetermined in the Church of England, as the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, and either make a new rule, or declare that the Church of England is indifferent what doctrine its members hold?

I suspect that in maintaining the right of the temporal Sovereign to have any subject righted, without his going to a tribunal abroad, the State overlooked that in matters of faith they were aiming to combine things necessarily incompatible, i.e. that they did not see that the judgment of the individual in a matter of faith might involve what they disclaim, the determining of the faith itself. They meant to claim the right of deciding all causes on certain fixed principles; they overlooked that the principles might not in all cases be so fixed, and so, if they were to decide at all, they would be forced into doing what they disclaimed, declaring that to be heresy which had not previously been so declared.

If this be the case as to the Privy Council, the question would be, how it can be remedied. All which 1 Eliz. c. 1 requires is, that the Queen should have the appointment of the Judges. But it might be provided, that in all cases involving the determination of doctrine, they should be the whole Synod of Bishops.

Mr. Justice Coleridge's reply, so far as it is a defence of the Judicial Committee, defends it, not as a final Ecclesiastical Court of Appeal, but as a Court of civil lawyers empowered to deal with the temporal consequences of decisions on questions of doctrine and discipline. But his letter has all the value which attaches to anything on such a subject proceeding from a very accomplished lawyer, who was also a devoted Churchman, and dealing with the question before it had been complicated by issues arising out of the Gorham and subsequent decisions.

MR. JUSTICE COLERIDGE TO E. B. P.

Park Crescent, January 11, 1850.

I could not answer your letter, as I wished, yesterday, nor before post-time to-day: yesterday Keble was here all day transcribing with the help of Mr. Copeland, and correcting a paper on our present Church grievances, and I was busy with him. To-day I have been in Court and am only now returned. Keble's paper of course turns in part on the subject on which your thoughts are occupied, and will

serve, I think, in some measure and sense, to quiet men's minds as to their position while it rouses them to better and secure it.

Now I come to your question, which for clearness's sake I transcribe: 'Whether the office of a Judge does not necessarily in some cases involve the new interpretation of those *authorities* upon which he founds his judgments?' By the word 'authorities' I understand you to mean the precedents, decisions, text-books, &c., which are to guide him in his judgments, not the authority which gives him his jurisdiction.

Understanding you thus, I answer that his office in all cases may, and in fact will in many, or some at least, involve such consequences. In deciding a particular case he is to bring it under a rule to be gathered from previous authorities—whether it falls under the rule or not must of course depend on the true understanding of the rule—and that again on the true interpretation of the authorities. The Judge may think those authorities have been misunderstood, that the language has been construed too largely, or too strictly, or that inferences have been drawn not warranted by the context, or the circumstances under which it was used.

It is in this sense I answer your question affirmatively; and it seems unnecessary to illustrate my meaning by any instances. But then a lawyer would not admit your consequence; that, 'in fact, he by his judgments limits, or enlarges, as it may be, the meaning of those authorities.' He may enlarge or limit the previous interpretation, but *ex hypothesi* he is seeking to find the true meaning, which must always be the same: if he goes beyond, or falls short of that, his judgment must be wrong; but the meaning of the authorities remains the same. For example, we are to find our rule of decision in a particular statute—that has been before expounded in a case decided in the Common Pleas—and that decision has governed similar cases since. *We*, however, think that their exposition was incorrect, and we either exclude a case from this rule, or bring one within it, which according to that exposition would fall within, or without it, as the case may be; in other words, we construe the statute more strictly, or largely, than they had done. Still I need not say that the authority, by which both profess to be guided, has but one meaning and remains unchanged.

The distinction between an encroachment of jurisdiction and an erroneous decision is often very fine; perhaps the true test is this: the former may be ascertained when the Judge *begins* his inquiry—he has no right to commence it—he is wrong from the beginning—and must be so all through—however correctly he draws his conclusion from his premisses: in the latter he is right in his beginning, and wrong only in his conclusion. E.g. let there be a Judge with jurisdiction only in cases of heresy: A. B. is libelled before him for a denial of the Divinity of the Second Person—here *upon the face of it* the charge is within the jurisdiction:—the Judge may decide rightly or wrongly whether the language proved amounts to a denial—but

there can be no excess of jurisdiction—he was right in beginning to examine into the case. . . . But suppose the charge *on the face of it* is of a matter merely of order or discipline, he ought to refuse to entertain it at all, and if he pronounces that to be heresy, he is not only wrong in his decision, but wrong in deciding on it at all. In the former case his decision might be *appealed* against to the proper Court of Appeal: in the latter *we* should restrain him from going on to a decision at all by our writ of prohibition.

Now, tried by this test, I am not sure that there is any objection to the mere procedure of the Privy Council to hear the Gorham case: the matter directly at issue in the Court below was the right to institution—a step in order to the attainment of a temporal right, induction and enjoyment of the benefice.

That right might have depended on some mere fact, wholly independent of spiritual considerations, such as canonical age, learning, morals, &c., but jurisdiction cannot depend on the nature of the questions to be discussed collectively in the cause, but upon that which is directly to be decided by the judgment. The distinction will be obvious, if we suppose the Bishop to have libelled Mr. G[orham] for heresy—then whether heretic or not is *the thing to be decided*—and the objection to the P[ri]v[ate] C[ouncil] entertaining that question at all, is an objection on Church principles to their jurisdiction.

Let us suppose that by law a heretic could not inherit land. A. B. claims an estate as heir-at-law to his father C. B. against D. who is in possession. No one can doubt that such an action might properly be brought in the Court of Queen's Bench. But D.'s defence is that he is next heir in default of A. B., and that A. B. cannot inherit because he is a heretic, e.g. an Arian. To which A. B. replies, admitting Arianism, but denying that he is therefore a heretic. Now perforce the Court of Queen's Bench must examine this question, *in order* to arrive at its judgment, on the title to the land. It may decide wrongly, but it cannot exceed its jurisdiction. In the Gorham case, therefore, I am inclined to think that the *crucial* difficulty does not arise. I quite agree that in the manner of dealing with this collateral point, a more seemly course might have been taken, more in analogy with the proceedings under similar circumstances, in our old Common-Law Courts. When the same precise question shall arise between the same parties in the pending *quare impedit*, instead of asking these Bishops to come and hear an argument upon it, as assessors, whom we shall listen to or not, as we think best, we shall send to the Archbishop for his certificate, and be bound by his decision.

You will not understand me as defending the constitution of the Court of Appeal, and I quite think that we are called on now to exert ourselves vigorously for a better ordering of such things—and it seems to me that the Gorham case furnishes a *safe* and favourable time for the effort. Although no harm may be done in this case, yet the same Court is the Court of Appeal for directly spiritual cases. And the

composition of the Court on the present occasion, as well as the exclusion by statute of all spiritual Lords from sitting on such appeals, cannot but strike ordinary men strongly.

It seems to me you are quite right in your view of the Supremacy, and it is very important that your view should be as generally made known as possible. I am very glad you have given me permission to show your letter, where I think it may be useful. I shall make use of your permission pretty freely, but not inconsiderately.

It occurs to me to mention, that the limit as to the declaration of heresy, which binds the Court of Arches, appears to me equally to limit the Court of Appeal—for they are to decide only whether the judgment of the Court below is right, and must of course try its correctness on the same principles, which the Court below was bound to regard in arriving at its judgment.

I believe I have said all that occurs to me on a subject which I confess I am not so much at home in, as perhaps I ought to be—and I am afraid I have not given you much help. But I very sincerely beg of you to apply to me again and again if you think I can throw any more light on any difficulties. It will be a real satisfaction to me to work under you and with you in such a cause. I am only afraid I may disappoint you. I came into the world somewhat too soon to have devoted much time to these considerations, when I had leisure; and now I have too little to acquire much sound knowledge on them.

I hope you are better.

Believe me most truly and affectionately yours,

J. T. COLERIDGE.

It may be worth your while to know that the meeting of the P[rivy] C[ouncil] on Tuesday is only to consider the case, and consult on the judgment—the framing it must, I should think, be a work of time. By an old rule of Privy Council, majority binds—and nothing is said of difference of opinion.

If you think it worth while, will you let Keble see my letter, as he may be advised to work on with his paper, and expand it; and it may answer doubts in his mind.

In other respects do what you will with it.

In forwarding this letter to Keble, Pusey says:—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[January 13, 1850.]

But the real question seems, 'Is the doctrine of the Church of England sufficiently defined or no?' or, in any case in which it is not defined, has the Civil Power the right conceded to it, to define it?

J. C.'s answer seems to me to come to this—'It cannot define it as matter of faith; it can define it as matter of discipline.' As to Holy Baptism, the doctrine of the English Church must continue to be the doctrine of the Creed, and her Formularies; but for all purposes of

discipline, the Supreme Court must have the right of construing the authorities : and if so, it may construe them right or wrong.

I should fear that the admixture of a few Bishops, or forming a Court of a few Bishops only, would be worse than the present state of things. For it would probably be too easy to select a few lax Bishops. Of the whole body, one should hope that they would be overruled to do nothing inconsistent with the Faith.

The profound disquiet of deeply religious minds at this time appeared in the case of Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce ; he wrote in his distress to ask Keble whether, whatever the Privy Council might decide, it was not a duty to refuse to communicate with Mr. Gorham on the ground that he had been condemned as a heretic by the Ecclesiastical Court of Canterbury.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Feb. 5, 1850.

I send you a note which has set me thinking very much, and I hardly know how to get over it. What I have told W. is—(1) That a man must not I suppose be counted a heretic without a distinct sentence of a competent Court : (2) That this sentence (of the Arches) hardly amounts to that : (3) That the way perhaps might be to proceed against him for direct heresy under the Church Discipline Act : (4) That in the meantime the Archbishop I suppose must stay proceedings, and we might have time to prepare ourselves for such a crisis.

I think your argument in the proof-sheets *must* do good—only that people's thoughts spring deeper.

Your ever-loving (in haste)

J. K.

Pusey could not agree. He would have let Mr. Gorham alone, in the hope that in time he might be converted, as others had been converted, to an acknowledgment of the truth. The Low Church clergy in tilting against the doctrines of Baptismal Grace were often making war, not on the doctrine of the Church, but on some aspect or consequence with which they themselves had erroneously invested it.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Christ Church], Feb. 7, 1850.

It is quite natural that people should feel very acutely now, particularly such as W., who have not had the existence and overt toleration of heresy continually brought against them as a note against the Church of England. One's answer and one's comfort is, out of

which we cannot get by any human means, God is helping us out of it by restoring truth. It seems a case in which we 'must let the ship drive' and not try to 'thrust it into' any 'creek.' Had measures, like this, been taken against Mr. Woodward, at Bristol, we should have lost one who is now an earnest maintainer and teacher of the truth. It seems like a state of bodily health, in which physicians look on, wait for God, and leave off remedies for a time, to see how He will work in the frame.

But then as to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, I suppose the majority of those who in words impugn it are really contending against something else: e.g. Mr. Goode against a belief that a person, having been baptized, must necessarily be in a state of salvation (i.e. of grace, he means, I suppose). Others define, as you know, regeneration to be that from which a person cannot fall. These, surely, are in error as to a matter of fact: it is not proved that they are heretics, it does not appear from what they say that they mean to deny anything which the Church affirms. This, I suppose, must be the Abp. of York's case (I did not read his Charge), in that he argued that Cranmer, &c., could not have held Baptismal Regeneration because they held Predestination, i.e. he did not know what the doctrine is.

As you say, they are not proved heretics. Dr. Hinds' was a very bad case. He must have recanted, had there been any discipline. Yet we hope that he is not, in his inmost heart, a heretic.

I hardly know what he means by 'our Bishops *having* committed themselves to an heretical course.' For they have taken 'no course' at all.

I suppose that Mr. Gorham's publication would bring him under the Church Discipline Act, yet it is hardly perhaps the same as if he had himself written it. It is an answer to his Bishop, and one sort of punishment has followed on it. I fear it might look like vindictiveness. I wish the Bp. of E. had taken the ground of his denying the 'One Baptism for the remission of sins.' It would have brought out before the Church what Mr. Gorham's special heresy is, and shown a good many that they *do* hold Baptismal Regeneration in that they believe original sin to be remitted in Baptism.

I do not see that W.'s case of 'our Bishops committing themselves to a wrong course,' has come, or is likely to come. The very thing which we are pressing for, 'judgment of Bishops in the case of heresy,' would be the very test; but one would hope that God would overrule any decision.

I cannot imagine the case which W. puts, as to a Bishop giving mission to Gorham *on the distinct understanding* that he denies the doctrine of 'One Baptism for the remission of sins.' I should think that most who impugn Baptismal Regeneration would start at its being supposed that they denied this. Mr Baring (London) did not suppose that there were above six clergy in the English Church who held with Mr. Gorham.

I cannot, here, answer what you probably can, whether one communicating with one, holding heretical errors, but not by any act severed from the Church, would so sever himself? The answer seems to be what you suggest, that a person is not a heretic until he is proved and declared such, and as such ejected. I should have thought many might have been puzzled by Mr. Gorham's statements. The heresy comes out in some seven or eight places, amid a great deal of declaration of accepting the Formularies of the Church and believing what the Church believes.

Keble held out. He felt that if Mr. Gorham was not condemned as a heretic, he was condemned as being so much like one that to hold communion with him would be scandalous.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage,
Shrove Saturday, [Feb. 16], 1850.

I wish I may be wrong, but fear that you in your loving heart a little underrate the difficulty which R. W. has raised. Surely in the case supposed (the Archbishop giving mission to Gorham after Sir H. J. F.'s sentence) it would be different from all the tolerance of heretics which we have hitherto borne with as we might, because none of those were *condemned* heretics. If G[orham] were condemned *as a heretic*, so to fraternize with him would be breaking the Sacramentum Unitatis (would it not?) and intercepting our communion with the Head. Ought we in such a case to look to the *visible* consequences? I do not think, however, that he was condemned as a heretic, but only of false doctrine, as Oakeley. But it looks so like the other, that I fear it will be very scandalous: and to prevent this I proposed the suit: which even apart from this apprehension some think desirable. Might it not have the effect of bringing into strong light Mr. G[orham]'s *peculiar* doctrine, and so showing the Low Church in general that they need not be disturbed at anything that happens to him? I have written to our Bishop, stating the difficulty and what occurred to me on it, and particularly pressing this last point. I hope I may not have done harm; but it is always a relief to me when I have told him things, and he is so cautious that one has no fear of committing him.

I wonder what you think of the Bp. of L.'s proposal. I fancied we ought to be very thankful for it; but how the restless ones take it I don't know. It was remarkable in the Education Meeting on Thursday how every allusion to *non-jurorship* was caught up and hailed by the crowd.

These excessive and hasty alarms expressed in private letters by Pusey's friends were in danger of finding open expression at the meetings of those Church Unions which

were now being formed throughout the country. An effort was made in the London Church Union to call the further attention of Churchmen, and of the Government, to the importance of the questions raised by this appeal to the Privy Council. At a first meeting Pusey, who had come up from Asherne near Dartmouth, was present, but without Keble. He reported to Keble that 'some very strong and painful words' fell from those who were disposed to make the worst of the situation. He had had to threaten to withdraw from the meeting of the Committee unless a very exaggerated statement of the claims of the Crown was modified. He was indeed on the point of leaving, when Charles Marriott persuaded the authors of the resolution to accept a compromise. Pusey wrote apologetically to Keble about the resolution which actually passed. He hoped that his friend would not think it too strong. It ran thus :—

'That by the suit of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter* now pending by appeal in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as well as by the case of *Escott v. Martin* in the year 1842, it appears that the Crown, through a Court constituted by Act of Parliament, alone exercises a power to confirm, reverse, or vary, by a final judicial sentence, the decisions and interpretations of the Courts of the Church in matters of doctrine.'

These alarms were not unshared by Archbishops and Bishops alike. A conference of the Bishops was held on the subject ; and as a result of their deliberations, the Bishop of London introduced into the House of Lords on Feb. 5, 1850, the 'Clergy Proceedings Bill,' to which allusion has already been made. By this Bill a new Court of Appeal in cases of heresy was to be substituted for the Judicial Committee. It was to consist of the two Archbishops, the three senior Bishops according to the date of their consecration, the Lord Chancellor, the Dean of the Arches, the Judge of the Consistory Court of London, and the Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge. As the two Ecclesiastical Judges represented spiritual persons, the Lord Chancellor was the only layman, pure and simple, in the proposed Court. Bishop Blomfield, in introducing the Bill,

described it as a strictly Church tribunal ; and Archbishop Sumner, when supporting the Bishop of London, urged that the present state of the law on the doctrine and discipline of the Church was acknowledged to be excessively defective. It was chiefly owing to the defective constitution of the Court of Appeal that the Church now stood in a position of some difficulty ; it could never be satisfactory that questions relating to the doctrine and discipline of the Church should be submitted to a tribunal of laymen.

It would seem that this measure was proposed by the Bishop of London at this juncture in the hope that the Privy Council would hesitate to pronounce on a subject which the Bill implied they were unfit to settle. But, as we shall see, this hope was destined to disappointment. The opposition of the Government finally disposed of this well-intended and generally well-conceived effort to lighten the burden of the Church, and to solve a difficult question that vexed the minds of Churchmen, and it may be said of statesmen, for the next forty years.

Already rumours were in circulation to the effect that the decision of the Judicial Committee would be against the Bishop of Exeter ; and the Bishop was already thinking how to act in such a contingency, and from this time until the judgment was delivered Pusey's correspondence seems to have been chiefly concerned with this practical side of the question.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

6 Clifford Street, Feb. 14, 1850.

You have doubtless heard that the judgment is to be against us : forgive the plural pronoun. I cannot consider myself as more than the party in whom the common question of the Church is to be tried.

Something *seems* to have arisen—but it is unwise to build hope upon it—that may shake the resolution of the Committee. The delay, the anxiety which is known to be felt as to the mode of expressing the judgment—and perhaps the final impossibility of their devising words which shall not stultify the eminent persons who are to use them, for it has been understood that they are to affirm the Church's doctrine, while they are to pronounce the denial of it not to justify a Bishop in refusing mission to the clerk who denies it—may, after all, *enforce* an opposite decision.

It is anxiously wished by them to give the judgment next week—before Baron Parke starts for the Midland circuit—and Thursday is the day named, as the most likely.

Now, it will probably be deemed by me right to address the Archbishop of Canterbury in a *public* letter, as soon as shall be possible, after the judgment, *if it be adverse*. In that case, I must speak plainly respecting his own erroneous statements on Baptism. *Inter alia*, I shall notice the following sentence in his Charge of 1841, p. 35 :—

‘He instituted His Sacraments that they who observed them might be a visible Body of witnesses to Him in the world : and that, *after the usual manner of the Divine operations*, there might be known and manifest *channels, in which His Spirit might flow*, to the edification and comfort of believers.’

This is a marvellous statement, coming from a Bishop, now grown into an Archbishop, in this branch of Christ’s Church. How he can reconcile his description of Sacraments to the exclusive application of the term to Baptism and the Lord’s Supper—or, rather, how he can speak of the ‘*usual manner of the Divine operations*’ as being that which God is pleased to adopt in those two Sacraments—it is not very easy to conjecture.

Be that as it may, I venture to ask your assistance in *animadverting* on the passage. The *fuller* you can conveniently make your argument, so long as it shall be sent *soon*, the more I shall be obliged.

In his Grace’s comment on the Gospel of St. John iii. 5 is the passage which I enclose. It is really startling to read such a statement from such a place. This, too, I wish to deal with—and shall be thankful for your aid. But, if there be not time for *both*, pray send me the *former*, as the more needed.

Yours, my dear Sir,

Always most faithfully,

H. EXETER.

P.S. To say, as his Grace says, or manifestly intends to say, that the prayers of faithful parents, or pro-parents, are necessary to the efficacy of Christ’s Baptism, is manifestly gross Pelagianism. Pray tell me where I can find a *canon* of the Church to that effect.

Perhaps, in writing your answer, you will kindly bear in mind my infirmity of vision. I shall be grieved to lose a word of what you may say.

Pusey’s first thought was now as always ‘What would Keble say?’ and the Bishop of Exeter’s extract from the Archbishop’s Charge of 1841 was sent to Hursley accordingly. Keble thought that the words admitted of a better interpretation than had been put on them by Bishop Phillpotts, but he was as strong as ever in favour of doing something

to relieve the Church of the charge or suspicion of acquiescence in heresy.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Feb. 19, 1850.

. . . The questionable clause ['after the usual manner of the Divine operations'] may be fairly enough taken to mean what Hooker says, E. P., V. lvii. 3. If you look at it, you will see at once what I mean. It seems to me only right and charitable to make the best of the doctrinal statements of such men as the Archbishop. And as I fully expect that we shall have in some way or other to make some public statement in which his sayings will have to be noticed, I am very glad that you are placing the matter in that light before the Bishop. What a strange turn the matter seems to be taking. I cannot frame any producible statement in my own mind for whoever will have the honour of pronouncing that judgment. I cannot see by what subtilty the premiss and conclusion can be tacked together. It will be very scandalous and must lead to some such measure as the Bishop of London's. It will not I hope be felt by R. W. as affecting his position; but how about our other restless friends? What will be our right course: e.g. as to communion with Gorham, &c.? I still find myself driven back to the notion [of] prosecuting him for heresy; which, however, I fear is not practical, as you say no more of it, and Coleridge does not answer my questions about it. I think I must enclose you another letter from R. W. *This* objection to such a course has been started, and I feel it strongly:—viz. that if one were driven by appeal to the Final Court under the Church Discipline Act, it is really little or no better than the present. As to the Bp. of London's new Court, I don't think we ought to be satisfied with it or with any other which has not the sanction of Convocation: nor with Convocation itself, unless we had a better way of appointing Bishops. Whatever we assent to we must take as the Radicals do, or as the Church party in France—avowedly as a mere instalment. . . .

Ever your most loving

J. K.

Pusey acquiesced in Keble's proposal for a prosecution of Mr. Gorham for heresy, and suggested this course to the Bishop. The Bishop, in thanking Pusey for his support, adds the following postscript:—

'6 Clifford Street, Feb. 20, 1850.

'There is one matter on which I am very anxious—to do what I can to prevent eager Churchmen from renouncing our Church, if the judgment be what is expected—and still more if such functionaries as the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London have declared in

favour of it. That no such men, nor any individual men, can commit the Church, is certain; yet I much fear that many will act as if it were otherwise. Pray tell me what you would think it best to say, in order to stop them.'

In a second letter Pusey, following Keble's suggestion, had endeavoured to throw the shield of Hooker over Archbishop Sumner's equivocal language about the Sacraments. But Bishop Phillpotts would not have it so. In his reply he adds a postscript to the following effect:—

6 Clifford Street, Feb. 22, 1850.

'I am sorry to say that our friend Maskell seems to have a morbid eagerness to find all wrong in our Church, and to make out a case for his own secession. I wish he may stop short of Rome; but I have very strong apprehensions. You have probably seen his first Letter on the Position of the High Church Party. It is on the Supremacy—clever, but, I think, unsound.'

Pusey at this time must have been the most trusted correspondent of Bishop Phillpotts on the subject which occupied his mind. The Bishop writes again on the following day:—

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

[*Confidential.*]

London, Feb. 23, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,

I hear nothing more. All seems doubtful, except, I fear, that the doubt of what will be the *general character* of the judgment, is very small. The difficulty of devising words which may satisfy the lay Judges, *for their own credits*' sake, is our only hope.

In respect to my position, as to Institution, it is as follows:—

If the decision be against me, my jurisdiction, *pro hac vice*, passes to the Superior Ordinary, the Archbishop; but, if it be for me, while the decision of the Archbishop's Court is affirmed, there is a mode of obtaining a remitting of the case to the Archbishop *personally*. It is thus:—

Besides the 'Duplex Querela,' an action of 'Quare Impedit' against me *at the suit of the Crown* is pending. Supposing me to be dismissed from the 'Duplex Querela,' the action may nevertheless go on; and, if it does, the Court of Queen's Bench would certainly send the case to the Archbishop, who would be required to certify whether Mr. G[orham] was of unsound opinions according to the evidence of the examination. His Grace, in this case, would doubtless certify that Mr. G. was *not* of unsound opinions. A writ would then issue to me from the Court of Q[ueen's] B[ench] *commanding me to institute*. This writ (I WRITE CONFIDENTIALLY) I should, as you, I hope, doubt

not that I should, *disobey*. This disobedience would bring me into a contempt ; and, on motion for attachment, I should be committed till I purge the contempt—i. e. till it should please God to release me both from prison and from life.

Probably this would be the best course for the case to take ; but there is little hope that the *first* step be taken—that the Judicial Committee decide in my favour. If it be, the rest may follow.

Now, I *entreat* you not to notice this communication to any one. I have thought it necessary to ascertain exactly my position, in order to my own guidance. But I should be very sorry if it should become prematurely known.

Yours very faithfully,

H. E.

Maskell's published letter gives me great concern. I consider it the mischievous and most ill-timed effusion of a very self-willed man.

My own course of *Protest*, or *whatever it be*, cannot be shaped till I know what the terms of the judgment shall finally be.

Meanwhile, I earnestly entreat your kind and able consideration of the points likely to be involved, and of the best mode of dealing with them.

One supposition is, that they will decide that the doctrine of Spiritual Regeneration in Baptism being acknowledged as the doctrine of the Church, Mr. Gorham did not, at the examination, express anything contrary to, or inconsistent with it. Yet this must require much ingenuity to state with decent plausibility.

Keble was being consulted at each step of this correspondence with the Bishop of Exeter.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church, Feb. 22, 1850.

I send you more stunning intelligence than any yet. What would you advise me to advise the Bishop ?

The prosecution upon Mr. G.'s special heresy might be some stay. People cannot be thinking of the Creed when they speak of 'open questions.'

What should be the *point* of the Bishop's Protest : to say Anathema to those who deny the remission of sins in Baptism, or what ?

This report that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were ready to treat 'the grace and efficacy of Baptism as an open question' was a great shock to Keble.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage,

Ember Saturday in Lent, [Feb. 23], 1850.

May He be with us, for surely it is a sad strait. It seems, however, so far clear, that we must all in our places protest: and I should have thought that the simple ground of the Creed, as e.g. I have stated it to our Bishop, would be sufficient to take at first. A Bishop is only bound to *due* obedience to his Metropolitan: and of course he continues under his obligation to drive away bad doctrine. As at present advised, I should not use the word 'Anathema,' but should hold the Archbishop to his own Court's decision, demanding a Synod. I should also *intimate* something of possible suspension of Communion till the matter was synodically settled.

I had also considered that if Sir H. J. F. should give the matter against us, we could not consistently appeal to the P[ri]v[ate] C[ouncil], even under the Church Discipline Act.

I cannot think that the Nonjurors' position was so very bad or useless an one. I seem to trace our present life in good measure to it.

I am ashamed to say nothing has been done yet about the prosecution for heresy. I will try and write to Badeley by next post. I did not know till last night that you consented to that step.

On the next day Keble sends further thoughts as to the course which the Bishop might take in the event of an adverse decision. In this letter we trace to its source the Bishop's resolution to summon a Diocesan Synod in order to reaffirm the Catholic doctrine on behalf of his Diocese.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, St. Matthias, 1850.

It strikes me that the regular way in the case supposed would be for the Bishop to summon a Diocesan Synod and for the whole Diocese to move synodically, protesting, setting forth the true doctrine, and demanding a Provincial Council to settle it: of course also communicating their proceedings to the Bishops and Archdeacons of all other Dioceses in communion with the See of Canterbury. In this way the matter would be brought officially under cognizance of this whole branch of the Church; and there would be no excuse for persons to slight or disparage it on personal grounds.

This is all I can say to-night.

Ever yours most lovingly,

J. K.

Pusey sent on Keble's suggestion to the Bishop, but with a modification of his own. He was anxious that the

language of the Creed, 'One Baptism for the remission of sins,' and not any statement drawn up by the Bishop of Exeter, should be the formula of concord.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church, Feb. 25, 1850.

I sent your suggestion, but I hope it was agreeable with your meaning that I suggested putting prominently the Article in the Creed 'One Baptism for the remission of sins,' setting forth that it had been denied in the Diocese: that he had refused Institution to a clerk, &c.; that his act had been sanctioned by the highest Ecclesiastical Court, reversed, &c.; that he called upon his clergy to reaffirm that such was the faith of the Church.

I did this because I hoped that the acknowledgment of the remission of original sin would be a great step towards agreement on Regeneration; that people would have no misunderstandings (i. e. those who by 'Regeneration' mean 'Conversion'), that they would not be held back by a fear of driving a large number of the clergy away, and that we should not have the disgrace and scandal of stormy and dissentient Synods.

I should quite dread an appeal to the Church whose animus seemed to be, that all should be ejected who did not hold Baptismal Regeneration: (1) because people are inured to the present state of things and dislike strong measures; (2) they are hopeful about individuals, and would not eject them; (3) there is the misunderstanding about the term; and so (4) I should expect to be defeated and we should be worse off than now. The Church seems to me like a sickly person recovering: one would watch his strength returning and not put it to any decisive trial one could help, which one did not feel morally sure it would stand.

But the Lord will provide.

I see that I suggested a Diocesan Synod as you proposed, and communication [of] their sentence to other Bishops, Archdeacons, as you said. But I was afraid to say anything about asking for a Provincial Council before again asking you, fearing that things would go wrong. We are so unused to strong measures.

Mr. Badeley thought it impossible at the time to prosecute Mr. Gorham for heresy. But the Bishop of Exeter took up warmly the other proposal that he should summon a Diocesan Synod.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

London, Feb. 28, 1850.

I thank you very much for your suggestion of a Diocesan Synod, for the purpose which you mention—and, if the judgment be to the

effect of regarding Baptism an open question, or anything like it, I shall be greatly inclined to act on the suggestion.

The very step would indicate vitality, and might tend to rouse other portions of our Church.

A practical difficulty would arise from the extent of my Diocese, and the great number of my clergy—more than 800.

This demands consideration, and it seems not unlikely that time will be given to us for consideration.

The decision of the Judicial Committee was now so fully anticipated that its substance was filling men's minds even less than its possible consequences. Thus on the very eve of its publication Bishop Phillpotts writes to Pusey mainly about Mr. Maskell's pamphlet and the necessity for a clear understanding as to what is and is not involved in the Royal Supremacy.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

Bishopstowe, March 7, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,

I am very much obliged for all your papers, which I deem *most* valuable. If it be necessary—and when it is necessary—I shall not scruple to avail myself of your kind offer to come hither.

I am informed by this day's post, that it is possible judgment will be given to-morrow. Yet, as notice was promised by Lord Campbell to be sent to me—and none has arrived—I doubt the accuracy of the rumour. It may indeed have been sent to Exeter.

Yours most faithfully,

H. EXETER.

I feel that the position in which the case now stands leaves me no option but to deal with the Archbishop plainly and decisively.

I am very glad that you have turned your thoughts to the *Supremacy* question. I have drawn up a Petition to the Queen in which I have entered into it pretty fully, and should be glad to shew it to you before it is sent. At present, I am stopped, till we know what is to happen on Friday. It may not be necessary.

Maskell's very offensive Pamphlet has done much harm. Every one whom I talk with on the subject agrees in condemning its tone and resisting its argument. I have told him my mind very plainly.

On March 8, 1850, the Judicial Committee gave its award. Of the lay judges, Vice-Chancellor Knight Bruce alone dissented: of the three prelates who attended the hearing, the Bishop of London dissented; the Primates of Canterbury and York concurred.

The Court described the limits of the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in cases of this kind in the following words: 'This Court, constituted for the purpose of advising Her Majesty in matters which come within its competency, has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and Formularies; and we consider that it is not the duty of any Court to be minute and rigid in cases of this sort. We agree with Sir William Scott in the opinion which he expressed in *Stone's case*, in the Consistory Court of London, "That if any Article is really a subject of dubious interpretation, it would be highly improper that this Court should fix on one meaning, and prosecute all those who hold a contrary opinion regarding its interpretation."'

And taking this view of their authority they decided with regard to the opinions of Mr. Gorham (their statement of which has already been quoted) that they are 'not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, and that Mr. Gorham ought not, by reason of the doctrine held by him, to have been refused admission to the vicarage of Brampford Speke.'

It was natural that the Bishop of Exeter would not quietly accept such a reversal of his own decision; besides, he was most thoroughly alive to the consequences which were likely to ensue. His first step was one for which he had for some days been preparing in his correspondence with Pusey. In reply to the Bishop's question what he should do to prevent secessions to Rome in the event of an adverse judgment, Pusey had supplied him with materials for a Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. This Letter appeared on March 25, 1850. Few documents of the kind, since Law's Letters to Hoadley, can rank in importance with this famous Protest. Deep conviction and common-sense, trenchant logic and indignant irony are in their turn

brought to bear with triumphant effect on the judgment of the Judicial Committee. Space will not allow a summary of a document that belongs to history; but its concluding sentences must be quoted. After noticing that 'serious doubts have been raised in the minds of many, whether the Church, if she continue passive under this judgment, would not forfeit her claim to be a portion of the Church of Christ,' the Bishop entreats the Primate to call together his comprovincial bishops; and invite them to declare what is the faith of the Church on the articles impugned in this judgment. He then concludes as follows:—

'I have one most painful duty to perform. I have to protest not only against the judgment pronounced in the recent cause, but also against the regular consequences of that judgment. I have to protest against your Grace's doing what you will be speedily called to do, either in person, or by some other exercising your authority. I have to protest, and I do hereby solemnly protest, before the Church of England, before the Holy Catholic Church, before Him Who is its Divine Head, against your giving mission to exercise cure of souls, within my diocese, to a clergyman who proclaims himself to hold the heresies which Mr. Gorham holds. I protest that any one who gives mission to him till he retract, is a favourer and supporter of those heresies. I protest, in conclusion, that I cannot, without sin—and, by God's grace, I will not—hold communion with him, be he who he may, who shall so abuse the high commission which he bears¹.'

The form and manner of this remarkable pamphlet was entirely the Bishop's: Pusey could not, if he would, have supplied it, and some parts of it would not have befitted him. But of the solid material not a little was Pusey's. On the day that the Letter appeared in London the Bishop wrote to Pusey: 'Accept my warmest thanks for the great trouble which you undertook for me, and have performed most judiciously.' One service entails another. Mr. Goode, who was now the main advocate of Mr. Gorham's views on Baptism, replied to the Bishop of Exeter². On one

¹ 'A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury,' by the Bishop of Exeter, p. 90. London, Murray, 1850.

² 'A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, containing an examination of his Letter

to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from William Goode, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of All Hallows the Great and Less.' London, Hatchard, 1850.

point the Bishop had made an historical error. He had unguardedly alluded to the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage as being received by the whole Church. Pusey had pointed out that his statement of the case was open to criticism; but the warning reached the Bishop too late to be of service. The Bishop's Letter had been published. Mr. Goode denounced the misstatement, 'when proceeding from a Bishop,' as a 'discredit to us all.' The Bishop fell back on Pusey for assistance. Pusey's reply¹ to Mr. Goode on this point is inadequate: all that could be safely said was that at a late date, though certainly before the Reformation, the Canon quoted by the Bishop was accepted by the Eastern and Western Church. The Bishop's statement was undoubtedly incorrect. But so strong was the evidence for the acceptance of the Canons considered that Pusey is able to cite the authority of Baronius, Schelstrate and Tillemont in their favour. Pusey at this time contemplated a complete reply to Mr. Goode's pamphlet; and had made preparations for it, when his time and thoughts were absorbed by dangers from an opposite quarter.

But in another way also the Bishop tried to relieve the widespread anxiety among Churchmen. He endeavoured to obtain a decision that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council never ought to have dealt with Mr. Gorham's case at all. He applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a Rule to prohibit the institution of Mr. Gorham, on the ground that an appeal from the Court of Arches lay properly to the Upper House of Convocation, and not to the Queen in Council. The Rule was refused on April 25, and a month later the Bishop appealed to the Court of Common Pleas, but with a like result. Thence he applied to the Court of Exchequer, where Sir Fitzroy Kelly obtained a rule nisi, which however, after arguments, was discharged on July 8. It was clear that no remedy was to be obtained in this way from the Civil Courts. But the Bishop had been preparing for these failures; and on the morrow of the decision of the Court of Common Pleas he placed his plans before Pusey.

¹ *Guardian*, May 1, 1850, p. 307.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

Draper's Hotel, 28 Sackville Street,

May 28, 1850.

My failure in the attempt to annul the judgment of the Judicial Committee has not much surprised, nor at all disheartened, me. I hope I have faith enough to see and feel—as well as to acknowledge—that it is best for us, that results are in the disposal of higher Wisdom than man's.

The close is now approaching. On Friday next, I shall obey the monition of the Court of Arches, by bringing Mr. Gorham's Presentation into Court, and so leaving matters open for the Institution of him by the Archbishop.

But it appears to me that I am bound to lay before His Grace the special reasons on which I ought to call on him not to institute; in other words, the special heresies declared by Mr. G.

I earnestly ask your advice and assistance on this point, both as to *the form* in which my Protest should be made—and also as to the particular statements of Mr. G. to be adduced as the ground of Protest.

I enclose a Paper—part of a Letter—addressed to me, two or three weeks ago, by one of the ablest of our Judges, and a well-read and very sound Churchman.

I think his view so important, that I am much inclined to avail myself of it—perhaps in a Letter to my Clergy; and in the first instance, in my Protest to the Archbishop.

I may tell His Grace that the Judicial Committee have not decided that Mr. G.'s heresies are *not* heresies; but only that his statements, on which their judgment was formed, were merely of the neutral character stated in the enclosed paper; that, therefore, His Grace must bear the undivided responsibility of pronouncing by the solemn act of conferring the Cure of Souls, that the holding of such heresies is not a disqualification.

I heartily wish I could see you; but that, I fear, is too much to ask

Yours, my dear Sir, most faithfully,

[Signed] H. EXETER.

Rev. Dr. Pusey.

Pardon my having recourse to an amanuensis.

The execution of this resolution was delayed by the proceedings in the Court of Exchequer; on their failure, the Bishop obeyed the monition of the Court of Arches. He accompanied this serious act by a solemn protest, in which he pointed out the difference between that statement of Mr. Gorham's teaching which the Judicial Committee had framed as the basis of its decision, and those statements of

Mr. Gorham himself, which the Bishop held to be contrary to the doctrine of the Church, and which had determined him to refuse institution to the living of Brampford Speke. Mr. Gorham had stated that remission of sins, adoption into the family of God, and regeneration must take place, in the case of infants, not in, or by means of, but before Baptism; he had not only denied the invariably regenerating efficacy of the sacrament, but had taught that when there was any such thing as regeneration at all, it was conferred altogether independently of the sacrament. This was very different from the error which the Judicial Committee had acquitted. Pusey was of one mind with the Bishop as to the importance of the distinction between the opinions which Mr. Gorham really held, and the opinions which the Judicial Committee attributed to him. Mr. Gorham had been refused institution for reasons which had not been taken into consideration by the body which ultimately decreed that he should be instituted.

After stating his point, with his wonted ability, the Bishop concluded as follows:—

‘Now we, the said Henry, Bishop of Exeter, taking the premises into our serious and anxious consideration, and furthermore considering that the judgment of Her Most Gracious Majesty in Council on the said appeal was pronounced solely in reliance on the statement made in the report and recommendation of the said Judicial Committee, as being a just, true, and sufficient statement, do, by virtue of the authority given to us by God, as a Bishop in the Church of Christ, and in the apostolic branch of it planted by God’s providence within this land, and established therein by the laws and constitution of this realm, hereby solemnly repudiate the said judgment, and declare it to be null and utterly without effect *in foro conscientiae*, and do appeal therefrom in all that concerns the Catholic faith to “the sacred Synod of this nation when it shall be in the name of Christ assembled as the true Church of England by representation.”

‘And further, we do solemnly protest and declare, that whereas the said George Cornelius Gorham did manifestly and notoriously hold the aforesaid heretical doctrines, and hath not since retracted and disclaimed the same, any Archbishop or Bishop, or any official of any Archbishop or Bishop, who shall institute the said George Cornelius Gorham to the cure and government of the souls of the

parishioners of the said parish of Brampford Speke, within our diocese aforesaid, will thereby incur the sin of supporting and favouring the said heretical doctrines, and we do hereby renounce and repudiate all communion with any one, be he whom he may, who shall so institute the said George Cornelius Gorham as aforesaid.

‘Given under our hand and Episcopal seal this 20th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1850.

‘H. EXETER.’

The protest was unavailing. The Bishop persisted in his conscientious refusal to institute Mr. Gorham, who notwithstanding was instituted on August 6, 1850, by Sir H. J. Fust, as Dean of the Arches, under the *fiat* of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IX.

THE following letter, which was addressed by Dr. Pusey to the public press in December, 1849, is of sufficient importance to be preserved here.

SIR,

As two of the correspondents of the *Morning Chronicle* have commented upon Mr. Badeley's statement as to 'praevenient grace,' you will allow me, in justice to him, although without his sanction, to clear up the misunderstanding.

The question was not about 'praevenient grace' in itself, but as to the doctrine of 'praevenient grace' as applied to infants. The very definition of 'praevenient grace,' as quoted by the 'Catholic Priest,' 'ea quae initium boni operatur in hominibus, sive quae facit ut *homo* bene *velit*,' or that of our 10th Article, 'the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good *will*,' is plainly inapplicable to unconscious infants, who are incapable of any good will at all. Mr. Gorham's peculiar doctrine is, that infants, being born in original sin, are thereby *unworthy recipients* of Baptism, unless there be an act of 'praevenient grace' (Gorham Examination, Ans. 15, p. 83). Upon this act of 'praevenient grace' antecedently to Baptism, he holds that those to whom it is given receive regeneration (Ans. 19, p. 85), justification, (Ans. 125, p. 197), adoption as sons (Ans. 40, p. 94; Ans. 60, p. 113; Ans. 96, 97, p. 172), and he makes Baptism a public attestation of this (Ans. 88, p. 169). In a word, he substitutes this act of 'praevenient grace' for Baptism, so that Baptism becomes the outward seal of a grace already given, and he says that it 'confirms faith' (Ans. 38, p. 93), which our Church in the Catechism asserts that infants cannot have. It is in this sense, as applied to infants, that Mr. Badeley says that the phrase 'praevenient grace' is unknown to the primitive Catholic Church or the Roman Church (as it clearly is).

The Nicene Creed must mean now, what it always meant. The Article, 'One Baptism for the Remission of Sins,' existed in the Baptismal Creed (as attested by St. Cyprian) before the Council of Nice. Tertullian, not a century after St. John, speaks of the Inter-

rogatories of Baptism as coming from the Apostles. St. Cyprian, his disciple, mentions 'one Baptism for the remission of sins' as included in those interrogatories. He states that remission of original sin was the very object of Infant Baptism. In the Pelagian controversy it was allowed, on both sides, that children were, by the rule of the whole Church, baptized 'for the remission of sins.' The Council of Carthage (A.D. 418), which was received by the whole Church, asserts that 'little ones, who could not as yet themselves commit sin, are *therefore truly* baptized for the remission of sins, that in them what was contracted by their birth might be cleansed by their re-birth.' So far from a 'praevenient grace' being necessary for the remission of original sin, in order that Baptism might be efficacious, the Church, from the first, held and (since the Nicene Creed must have the sense it always had) holds, that original sin is remitted by Baptism. It is implied by the practice of Infant Baptism itself. Infant Baptism would have no end, unless original sin were remitted by it. Unless original sin were remitted to all infants, it would be cruel to baptize infants without any possibility of knowing whether they have this act of 'praevenient grace,' without which Baptism (according to Mr. Gorham) must be received unworthily.

It was this doctrine which Mr. Badeley said was unknown to the Church. It is clearly contradictory to our own formularies, which presuppose the child to be in a state of nature, until by Baptism it is made 'a child of grace.' This view of Mr. Gorham is so novel that it has been said by one who ought to know well, that scarcely three clergymen in the Church of England hold it with him; and I should hope that Mr. Gorham himself has not sufficiently considered that his statement really contradicts the doctrine of the Nicene Creed. I am sure that most of those who deny baptismal regeneration have no idea that they are denying that original sin is (as the Church believes) remitted to infants in Baptism. And yet, since original sin is then remitted, and the infant is incapable of actual sin, it is thereby placed in a state of grace; and this is what was expressed by the Ancient Church, that 'what was contracted by their birth was cleansed by their re-birth.' Mr. Goode, certainly, in commenting on Bishop Davenant's statements, that 'all baptized infants are absolved from the guilt of original sin,' and that 'Justification, Regeneration, and Adoption of baptized little ones confers upon them a state of salvation *pro conditione parvulorum*,' states 'the great and all-important doctrine to be contended for is that an adult is not necessarily in a state of spiritual regeneration because he was baptized as an infant' ('Infant Baptism,' p. 275). If Mr. Goode means by this that an adult is not necessarily in a state of grace, and so may require a solid and entire conversion, notwithstanding the gift of God in Baptism, no Christian instructed in the first principles of the Faith would contend with him.

I would simply add that the denial of 'praevenient grace' in infants *before* Baptism has nothing to do with the statement that God does,

in St. Augustine's words, 'gratiam latenter infundit et parvulis.' 'Praevenient grace,' by its very nature, they cannot have: since this is grace 'disposing us that we may have a good will,' and when received is followed by co-operating grace, 'working with us when we have a good will,' whereas infants plainly can neither have a good will, nor act upon it.

Some of the above thoughts might, if followed out, tend to the peace of the Church; and to this end you would not object to admit this long letter.

Your humble servant,

A DOCTOR OF DIVINITY.

I enclose my name privately, to authenticate my letter.

CHAPTER X.

RESULTS OF THE GORHAM CONTROVERSY—PROCEEDINGS
IN LONDON CHURCH UNION—WORK ON THE ROYAL
SUPREMACY—CONTROVERSIES WITH MASKELL, ALLIES,
AND DODSWORTH—LETTER TO REV. W. U. RICHARDS.

1850.

THE admission of Mr. Gorham to his new benefice under the sanction of the highest legal tribunals was a comparatively unimportant consequence of this decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The correspondence of the last chapter has shown how painfully strained and anxious were the minds of many Churchmen as to what was involved in the trial. The authority of the Judicial Committee to decide in doctrinal questions had not been seriously examined so long as it was unexercised. But while the lay judges were actually engaged in this task, it was being argued by able writers that the existence of the present Court could not be justified, and yet it was only the legitimate working out of the position which the Church had deliberately adopted at the Reformation; that therefore for the last three centuries the Church of England had forfeited the right to be a true portion of Christ's Catholic Church. When the decision was actually given, the doctrinal question was added to the previous constitutional difficulty, and not a few minds regarded it once more as 'the handwriting on the wall,' which warned men that the Church of England was no safe home for believing souls.

Among those who thought thus were men of wide learning and of high reputation; and it seemed as if the events of 1845 would be repeated, not in Oxford especially, but

throughout the English Church. And the authorities of the Church of Rome were naturally not slow to make the most of the occasion.

'The only resource for the Church of England in this her time of need,' said Bishop Wiseman, 'is, I am persuaded, a return to the bosom of the Catholic Church; and I doubt not that this decision, guided as it has been by mere worldly wisdom, cannot appear otherwise than as a providential event, overruled by God for the advancement of His holy religion, and the triumph of His universal Church¹.'

Of the two sources of gravest uneasiness,—the doctrinal question about Regeneration and the constitutional question about the Royal Supremacy,—the latter could only be fought out by long and careful controversy. The former subject admitted of some immediate action. The Church had at that time no opportunity of any united expression of faith such as is now provided in the meeting of Convocation or even in Diocesan Synods. But it was felt that meetings of Churchmen might be held all over the country to reassert what was held to be the doctrine of the Church. Of course they were quite aware, as was said at the time, that this was a mere demonstration; but they knew that it would be of no slight weight. It was with a view to action of this kind that the London Church Union met on March 13th, five days after the decision of the Judicial Committee. Pusey had already been writing to various quarters on the different subjects at issue, 'in hopes,' as he told Keble, 'of allaying the fears of some who were terribly shaken.' He entreated Keble to be present at the meeting of the Union, and to be a member of a sub-committee. It contained, he said, 'turbid elements, and would sadly need some oil.' The meeting appears to have done little beyond agreeing to an address to the Bishop of Exeter, thanking him for the firm and consistent course he had maintained, and appointing a sub-committee to consider what measures should be taken in consequence of the judgment.

¹ 'Final Appeal in matters of Faith: a lecture delivered at St. George's Cathedral, Lambeth,' by Dr. Wiseman,

Roman Catholic Bishop of London. London, Strange, 21 Paternoster Row, 1850, p. 20.

That something must be done became increasingly apparent. While the London Church Union was endeavouring to organize a large public meeting in London, protests and declarations were being made in very various quarters. Of these the most important, in its terms, and in view of the names attached to it, was drawn up at a meeting held at Mr. J. R. Hope's house in Curzon Street.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. That whatever, at the present time, be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of 'Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter,' the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.
2. That the remission of original sin to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism is an essential part of the Article—'One Baptism for the remission of sins.'
3. That—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence—such sentence, while it does not deny the liberty of holding that Article in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction the assertion that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted except when God bestows Regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scriptures and the Church are wholly silent), thereby rendering the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious.
4. That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an Article of the Creed, contradictory of the essential meaning of that Article, is, in truth and in fact, to abandon that Article.
5. That, inasmuch as the Faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed destroys the Divine foundation upon which alone the entire Faith is propounded by the Church.
6. That any portion of the Church which does so abandon the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed, forfeits, not only the Catholic doctrine in that Article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the Universal Church.
7. That by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act, such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no more assure to its members the grace of the Sacraments and the Remission of Sins.
8. That all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church ought to be taken without delay, to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the recent sentence; as, for instance, by praying licence for the

Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine ; or by obtaining an Act of Parliament to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual.

9. That, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the said sentence.

H. E. MANNING, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester.

ROBERT I. WILBERFORCE, M.A., Archdeacon of the East Riding.

THOMAS THORP, B.D., Archdeacon of Bristol.

W. H. MILL, B.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

JOHN KEEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley.

W. DODSWORTH, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras.

WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

HENRY WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, M.A., Vicar of East Farleigh.

JOHN C. TALBOT, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.

RICHARD CAVENDISH, M.A.

EDWARD BADELEY, M.A., Barrister-at-Law.

JAMES R. HOPE, D.C.L., Barrister-at-Law.

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, M.A., Vicar of East Brent.

A second Protest, due in part, if not mainly, to Pusey's influence, proceeded from the younger and not the least brilliant Tutors at the University of Oxford, and bore forty-five signatures. It showed that the Church feeling and faith of the University had by no means been destroyed by the secessions of 1845 ; and it was notorious at the time that the address was warmly sympathized with by some residents who did not, for personal reasons, feel able to sign it. A close scrutiny of the document reveals the fact that it was in part modelled upon some of the declarations against Tract 90, and retorts upon the authors of the judgment of the Privy Council the charge of non-natural interpretation of the Formularies, which, nine years before, had been levelled so freely against Newman. It runs as follows:—

Whereas by the Statutes of the University of Oxford all Tutors are required to instruct the pupils committed to their charge 'especially in the Rudiments of Religion and the Articles of Doctrine set forth in the Synod held at London in the year of our Lord 1562' (Vid. Corpus Stat. Tit. iii. § 2) ;

And whereas it is declared in the 8th of those Articles that 'the three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture,'—and it is an Article of the Nicene Creed, 'I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins';

And whereas it is in the Formularies of the Church of England, amongst other passages containing and expressing the like doctrine, asserted of an infant 'lawfully' baptized, that 'this infant being born in original sin and in the wrath of God, is now by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism received into the number of the children of God and heirs of everlasting life,'—and the same doctrine is in express terms declared in the 'Catechism to be learnt of every person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop,' to wit, 'My Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven';

And whereas notwithstanding these and other like clear, distinct, and explicit assertions of the Faith of the Church of England, in common with the whole Church of Christ, principles of interpretation have recently been applied to the Formularies of the Church bearing upon the Sacrament of Baptism, by which opposite and even contradictory opinions may appear to be equally and indifferently tenable by Ministers and other members of the Church of England, thereby endangering the One Faith of Christ;

We the undersigned Tutors in the University, deeply persuaded of the extreme peril of all interpretations of our Articles, Creeds, and Formularies which are at variance with and evasive of their 'true, usual, literal meaning,' and desiring to secure ourselves as instructors of youth in this University from any suspicion of agreeing with or acquiescing in such interpretations, do solemnly declare, that, in the discharge of the duties imposed upon us by the above Statutes, we teach and maintain, and, by the help of God, will continue to teach and maintain, the remission of sins to all infants, in and by the grace of Holy Baptism, and also the regeneration of the same universally by that Blessed Sacrament, not only as a tolerated opinion, but as an essential doctrine of the Church of England in common with the Universal Church of Christ.

THOMAS SHADFORTH, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College.

WILLIAM HEDLEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College.

EDWARD C. WOOLLCOMBE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College.

JOHN R. T. EATON, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.

HENRY B. WALTON, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College.

WILLIAM SEWELL, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.

WILLIAM ANDREWS, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.

- JAMES P. TWEED, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.
FREDERICK FANSHAW, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.
RICHARD C. POWLES, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.
CHARLES DAMAN, M.A., Tutor of Oriel College.
GEORGE BUCKLE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College.
JAMES E. SEWELL, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College.
WILLIAM E. C. AUSTIN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College.
HENRY G. MERRIMAN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College.
GEORGE G. PERRY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College.
GEORGE FEREMAN, M.A., Chaplain and Tutor of All Souls College.
FREDERICK BULLEY, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen.
EDWARD H. HANSELL, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen.
THOMAS CHAFFERS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose.
WILLIAM PULLING, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose.
JOHN A. ASHWORTH, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose.
GEORGE HEXT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College.
OSBORNE GORDON, B.D., Censor of Christ Church.
EDWARD R. DUKES, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church.
THOMAS P. ROGERS, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church.
ARTHUR W. HADDAN, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.
SAMUEL W. WAYTE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.
THOMAS BRISCOE, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College.
WILLIAM DYKE, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College.
EDMUND S. FFOULKES, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College.
EVAN EVANS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Pembroke College.
BARTHOLOMEW PRICE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Pembroke College.
RICHARD GRESWELL, B.D., Tutor of Worcester College.
WILLIAM ANDREW, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College.

We, the undersigned, being engaged in public instruction in the University, concur in the above Declaration.

- CONSTANTINE E. PRICHARD, M.A., Fellow and Catechetical Lecturer of Balliol College.
EDMUND HOBHOUSE, M.A., Fellow and Divinity Lecturer of Merton College.
JOHN LEY, B.D., Fellow and Divinity Reader of Exeter College.
GEORGE H. HESLOP, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Queen's College.

NICHOLAS POCKOCK, M.A., Public Examiner in Disc. Math. et Phys., Queen's College.

WILLIAM BEADON HEATHCOTE, B.C.L., Fellow of New College.

JOHN C. ANDREW, M.A., Fellow, Mathematical and Greek Lecturer, of Lincoln College.

EDWARD HILL, M.A., Student and Mathematical Lecturer of Christ Church.

WILLIAM STUBBS, B.A., Fellow and Philosophical Lecturer of Trinity College.

GEORGE PETCH, M.A., Fellow and Rhetorical Lecturer of Trinity College.

Oxford. April 29, 1850.

This Protest was a manifesto addressed to parents by persons who were engaged in tuition and public instruction at Oxford; but two other declarations with a wider scope were drawn up and circulated among members of the University, and addressed to the Queen and the Archbishop of Canterbury respectively. The declaration of the Tutors had only repudiated that particular interpretation of the Formularies which had been put forward by the Judicial Committee. The addresses to the Queen and the Archbishop refer not only to the theological import of the recent decision as implying that the teaching of the Church of England on the subject of Baptism was 'ambiguous,' and so 'tending to produce an universal scepticism'; but also and especially to the unsatisfactory character of the Final Court of Appeal. The Queen was prayed to give her Royal Assent to the proposal that all questions touching the doctrine of the Church of England should be referred to a Synod; that the judgment of such a Synod should be binding upon the temporal Courts; and that the question of the grace of Baptism should be referred to the Church itself, in such a way as the Queen might be advised by the collective Episcopate. The Archbishop also was entreated to take such measures with advice of the Bishops of both provinces, as would ensure the ultimate decision of all doctrinal questions by a Synod, and the authoritative reaffirmation of the truth which had been called in question by the recent judgment. Both petitions were headed by

the venerable name of Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen. The only other Head of a House who signed was the Rev. Dr. Harington, the Principal of Brasenose. Every effort was made by Professor Hussey to interest other Heads of Houses to come forward; but, from whatever cause, the application was unsuccessful. The preparation and circulation of these petitions had added not a little to Pusey's usual correspondence. What form they should take was for a while under discussion.

'Bull,' wrote Pusey to Keble in April, 1850, 'is for a declaration rather than a petition from members of the University: what should you be for? A petition to the Crown, and for what ends? for a Synod, or for Convocation, or for both, to reaffirm the doctrine impugned? and then for a right Court of Appeal for matters of doctrine? I fear that a declaration is of no use whatever except to free individual consciences.'

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

April 26, 1850.

I should have thought that there could not be a better petition than Mr. Hussey's, if we ask for Convocation generally. If, as the Bishop of Exeter recommends, and, as I suppose, is wiser and more practical, we ask only for a Session to reaffirm or settle this doctrine, so far as it may have been disturbed, a very simple statement would be sufficient. Asking for a new Court of Appeal is a longer business. Whenever it is done, there is one topic which I should say ought to be more dwelt on than it has generally been in petitions which I have seen for that end: viz. that the authority from which this jurisdiction, so far as it is conferred by Parliament, emanates, is not only Lay, but without the Church. Were it the Queen's supremacy, we could bear it better, for the Queen is a Catholic Christian; but this is a restraint of her supremacy by a set of people—the House of Commons—who may be anything. I don't feel as if I could draw it up well for the University: but if anything occurs to me I will send it.

We have got our Bishop's reply to our Petition: very kind, but most unsatisfactory in doctrine, &c. I will send it you when copied.

People are feeling more and more that we *must* come to agitate for 'no Establishment.'

By all means *petition*, and do not only *declare*.

I think I like your first title best, 'Faith of the Church of England maintained, &c.'

Ever your most loving

J. K.

Petitions from the clergy continued all the while to pour in upon sympathetic and, more or less, unsympathetic

authorities. Thus, ten were addressed to the Crown ; twenty to the Archbishop of Canterbury ; two to the Northern Primate ; ten to the Bishop of London, including one from four Bishops of the Church of Scotland ; twenty to the Bishop of Exeter ; five to the Bishop of Bath and Wells ; two to the Bishop of Bangor ; four to the Bishop of Peterborough ; three to the Bishop of Oxford ; three to the Bishop of Salisbury ; one to the Bishop of Winchester ; one to the Bishop of Worcester ; three to the Bishop of Rochester ; one to the Bishop of Norwich ; three to the Bishop of Chester ; six to the Bishop of Ripon ; seven to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol ; three to the Bishop of Chichester, and one to the Bishop of Ely ; two to the Bishop (Maltby) of Durham ; two to the Bishop (Prince Lee) of Manchester ; two to the Bishop (Hampden) of Hereford.

While the protests were finding their way to Episcopal studies, Pusey and Keble were corresponding about the arrangements for the public meeting in London. Pusey did not like public meetings for religious objects. This was not for the selfish reason that he was not himself a good speaker in public ; but because he thought that the discussion of sacred topics before general audiences, and without those restraints which are happily imposed on speakers in a church, was inevitably attended with danger either to truth or reverence. Doubtless this has occurred to many other good men ; and yet they have held that in an age like ours, public meetings, with all their drawbacks, are unavoidable. So thought Pusey on this occasion. 'It may,' he wrote to Keble, 'be a necessary evil : and might in some way be overruled to good.'

Keble thought that the risk of mischief would be lessened if the speakers at the meeting were laymen. The clergy, he thought, should have a meeting by themselves, simultaneously with the great meeting, and preceded 'by a very solemn service. Delegates from the country might attend.' The object of the clerical meeting would be 'to agree upon a memorial to *all* the outlying bishops in our communion, Irish, Scotch, American, Colonial, stating our case,

and imploring aid in His Name'; while the lay meeting addressed itself to Churchmen generally at home. The sub-committee of the London Church Union was instructed to consider these suggestions; but it proved impossible to carry them out. The clerical meeting by itself would lack sufficient weight, and the laymen desired the sanction and guidance of the clergy. Eventually one large and mixed meeting was decided on; and it was to be held at St. Martin's Hall as soon as the result of the Bishop of Exeter's appeal to the Court of Exchequer had become known. As the time approached it appeared that this building would not be nearly large enough for the purpose. A new impulse had been given to the motives which prompted this meeting by the fate of Bishop Blomfield's Bill for a new Court of Appeal, which had been rejected in the House of Lords on June 2nd.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

35 Grosvenor Square, Monday evening, July 15, 1850.

We had a hurried meeting on Saturday, too late, as everything else has been, in which the difficulty was started, that very likely there would not be room for half the numbers. Exeter Hall was not to be had. People could not be left in the streets. Who was to receive them and speak to them in a second room, if necessary? Two names were put down; then Mayow asked me whether you would help. I doubted not that you would do anything for such an emergency. So he put down you and me. Hope was for leaving them in the street. . . .

The great meeting, or rather meetings of July 23, 1850, more than satisfied the hopes which had been formed by earnest Churchmen. St. Martin's Hall and Freemasons' Tavern were filled with men whose hearts were profoundly stirred on a subject which they felt to be of vital moment. Many of them had received the Holy Communion in the early morning; and the bearing of the meeting befitted the solemnity of the occasion. It had been suggested beforehand that there was to be no applause; and those who were assembled readily acquiesced in the proposal. The effect was said to have been that of a solemn synodical assembly, deeply impressed as they were with what was

due to Him Whose truth they believed to be in jeopardy among them.

In St. Martin's Hall, Mr. J. G. Hubbard (afterwards Lord Addington) presided : the only prelate who supported him being Dr. Bagot, the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Among the speakers were men who were never to meet again on a public platform. The older days of the Oxford Movement were recalled by the Rev. W. Palmer and the Rev. W. Sewell. They had stood aloof from Pusey and Keble since the troubled years which preceded Newman's secession; but a danger which threatened the plain sense of the Prayer-book and of the Nicene Creed brought them once more into perfect harmony with their old friends. The former warned the meeting that indifference to the doctrine of the Sacraments must be followed by a general decline towards infidel opinions; the latter was not less earnest on the duty of maintaining the Church's teaching of Baptismal Grace, but he added a warning against sympathies with Rome. Side by side with them, on the other hand, were those who had hitherto supported Anglican principles, but were already beginning to waver in their loyalty to the English Church. Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce argued, with temperate strength, that the Church of England must recover synodical action in order to reaffirm the imperilled truth; and Archdeacon Manning, in a speech containing sentences of the truest eloquence, contended that those who were present must carry away with them a clear and definite perception of the two principles on which they had met. These principles were, first, to recognize, to venerate, and to obey, the royal supremacy known to the common law of the realm, and secondly, to safeguard complete freedom of action for the divine office of the Universal Church.

Lord Feilding, better known afterwards as Lord Denbigh, presided at Freemasons' Hall, where some of the speakers in St. Martin's Hall, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Mr. A. J. B. Hope, repeated their arguments. But the attraction of this meeting lay in the careful and

deliberate utterances of Pusey and Keble. Keble, after dwelling characteristically on the bearing of the true doctrine of Baptism on the simple religion of the poor, went on to prepare his hearers for the long delay which, as he foresaw, must ensue before the question could be satisfactorily settled. The ancient Church taught patience under trials like these. The long agony of the contest with Arianism shewed this.

‘Look,’ he said, ‘at the early Church after Nicaea, A.D. 325 : how long was it before she had rest from the troubles which then beset her on a chief point of doctrine ? We are now in 1850, and some eager ones think it much too long to wait for 1851 or 1852 for settlement of our present trouble : but she waited until the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, under all sorts of interruptions and anomalies, charges of heresy, breaking of communion, &c. . . . The whole air of England seems to me to ring with voices from the dead and from the living, especially from the holy dead, all to this effect : “Stay here ; think not of departing, but here do your work.” If it seems to any unsatisfactory let him consider that we are under appeal and have been so for three hundred years.’

Pusey’s speech combined the theological and devotional aspects of the subject in his own peculiar manner. It might have seemed more outspoken and peremptory than either Archdeacon Manning’s or Archdeacon Wilberforce’s ; but its greater unreserve was the result of his greater confidence in his position.

‘We stand,’ he said, ‘where two roads part, the way of the world and the way of the Church ; the way of man and the way of God : the way it may be of earthly loss and heavenly gain, or the way of earthly prosperity and spiritual loss. For if the State will not, as Magna Charta pledges it, allow that “the Church should have liberties inviolate,” we must ask that the State will set us free from itself, and go forth, as Abraham, not knowing whither he went, poor as to this world’s goods, but rich with the blessing of that Seed in Whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. . . . We are met in the most solemn way. We meet having anew recited the symbol of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. We have, such of us that could, received our Lord ; and such as could not, were in spirit joined with us. We there offered ourselves, our souls and bodies (how much more did we offer everything earthly which we have !) to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice to God, through Christ ; and now we are met, in the name of that Saviour, to

maintain that faith—our Baptismal Creed—in which we were regenerated, with which we hope to die, and which we hope to transmit, in its full meaning, unimpaired, to the children's children of the Church. We have met, not merely to give vent to our feelings—not, by a protest, to rid ourselves of our responsibilities.'

In describing the doctrines which the meeting wished to assert, he said that they had come

'to demand, in behalf of each Christian peasant-parent, the assurance that his child does not return from Baptism as it went; for the child, the supporting belief, in every hour of temptation, despondency, and dejection, that it has been made the child of God; for all alike, the assurance that our Church has not departed from the Apostolic faith, does not degrade the faith to the level of human opinion, to be accepted or yielded, as a child's toy, by every one's caprice; that our Church has not parted with any portion of the good deposit, the faith once for all delivered to the saints, that faith in God the Son, for us made flesh, whereby the Church stands secure on the rock which is Christ, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'

Then, remembering the warm discussions which were now going on in private between himself and those whose thoughts were turning towards Rome, on the true import of the Reformation Statutes, he proceeded to argue that the legislation of that day did not mean to make the State the judge in matters of Christian doctrine, but only to protect individuals against temporal injustice which might be inflicted on them by ecclesiastical courts. He pointed out at length how serious was the 'oversight' which, as Lord Brougham had declared in the House of Lords, had been made by the Acts of 1833 and 1834, which without intending to do so had placed the decision of doctrinal questions in the hands of a Final Court of Appeal which was being constituted for other purposes: he pointed out that that body, with the wonted instinct of lawyers, would naturally be more careful 'lest they injure the vested interests of individuals than lest they injure the vested interests of our people in the faith of Christ.' In a passage which might almost seem prophetic, when read by the light of what has since occurred, he exclaimed, with regard to the principles on which the Committee had reached its decision:—

'Apply these principles to other articles of the Creed, and what will be the result? We believed that by no mistake could any doubt be thrown on the belief of the Church as to Baptismal Regeneration. We saw it expressed as plainly as if it were written in the sun, in all her formularies. We could not be persuaded that it could ever be judged that the Church of England did not teach that in Baptism all children were made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. The Judicial Committee itself seems to imply that such is rather the doctrine of the Church of England, only that it is not so stringently laid down that a clerk who does not hold it can, therefore, be rejected from cure of souls. What, then, as to other sacred doctrine? It would be far more difficult to prove that one who denied, or held any false doctrine as to the inspiration of Holy Scripture, taught contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. More difficult to prove it as to one who taught falsely as to the office of God the Holy Ghost. It would be more difficult to disprove by the letter of our formularies, the Socinian gloss on the word *αἰώνιος*, and so to maintain that a clerk is to be rejected for denying everlasting punishments, and, by consequence, everlasting rewards, to be the doctrine of the Church of England, than to disprove that Baptismal Regeneration of all infants is part of her faith. If, as is believed, and as there are already tokens, the last struggle of the Church is to be with unbelief, what a prospect does this open before us!'

And then in conclusion :—

'The prerogative of the Crown may be opposed [to us] : politicians may strive to subject the kingdom of Christ to the kingdom of the world ; our very fathers, the Bishops, may look anxiously on, fearing lest, if the doctrine be asserted without any explanation, some should fall away from the Church. But the hearts of kings are in the hands of God. He can turn them as He willeth : politicians can do that only which He willeth before to be done. He will strengthen the hands of our Bishops, and give them wisdom and the healthful spirit of His grace. Had we prayed more sooner, we might not be in this distress. Let us ask in His name Who hath all power in heaven and in earth. Let us become ourselves more such as He will hear. Let us ask perseveringly and we shall obtain ; for God gives to prayer of His own omnipotence. *Oratio vincit Deum.*'

The Bishop of Exeter, who had not felt himself at liberty to be present at the meeting, wrote to Pusey in terms of warm admiration.

'My eagerness,' he observed, 'to write to you was mainly caused by my wish to express to you my high admiration of your eloquent, and—what is far higher praise—your soul-stirring and most righteous address to the assembled Churchmen in Freemasons' Hall. I cannot

believe—in humble reliance on God's mercy—that such appeals as yours and Archdeacon Manning's to the high principles, which, we hope, are yet dominant in the hearts and spirits of myriads of our brethren, lay and clerical, can be in vain. But I fully feel the necessity of perseverance and activity.'

The meeting adopted five documents. The first is a Protest, contrasting the teaching of Mr. Gorham as stated in his work on 'The Efficacy of Baptism,' with the language of the Church of England in the Prayer-book and Articles; and which, since Pusey had much to do with framing it, and it is of permanent value as a careful statement of the case, may here be given in its integrity.

PROTEST.

WHEREAS, upon an appeal by the Rev. George Cornelius Gorham against the sentence of the Dean of the Arches Court of Canterbury, it has been declared by the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, in contradiction to the judgment of the Ecclesiastical Court, 'That the doctrine held by Mr. Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England;' and further, 'that Mr. Gorham ought not to have been refused institution to the Vicarage of Bramford Speke;'

AND WHEREAS the Reverend G. C. Gorham, being presented to the Vicarage of Bramford Speke, declared and has published:—

(*'Efficacy of Baptism,'* p. 83)—*'That no Spiritual Grace is conveyed in Baptism except to WORTHY RECIPIENTS, and' (that) 'as Infants are by nature UNworthy recipients, being born in sin and the children of wrath, they cannot receive any benefit from Baptism, except there shall have been a prevenient act of grace to make them worthy,'—*

herein declaring Original Sin (the remission of which is a promised effect of Baptism), to be a bar to the due reception of Baptism;—

AND WHEREAS the said G. C. Gorham, in accepting the Church's statement that 'Infants which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved,' holds and has published:—

(p. 85), *'That they MUST have been regenerated by an act of grace prevenient to their Baptism in order to make them worthy recipients of that sacrament;'*

And, moreover (p. 88), that *'the new nature MUST have been possessed by those "who receive baptism rightly," and therefore possessed BEFORE the seal was affixed;'*

(p. 113), *'That Faith and that filial state, though clearly to be "ascribed to God," was given to the worthy recipient BEFORE Baptism, and not in Baptism;'*

(p. 197), '*As Faith must PRECEDE beneficial Baptism, and as Justification is invariably consequent on Faith, therefore Justification also PRECEDES beneficial Baptism, and cannot be equivalent to it;*'

thereby declaring that the gifts of Regeneration, Adoption, Remission of Sins, and Justification, which the Catholic Church—and in it our own—has ever taught and does teach to be given by God, in and by the Sacrament of Baptism, are given before Baptism, upon some prevenient act of grace, whereof Scripture and the Church are wholly silent ;

AND WHEREAS the doctrine of the Church of England is declared as follows :—

1st. In the NICENE CREED :—‘ I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.’

2ndly. In her TWO FORMS OF MINISTRATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BAPTISM OF INFANTS—wherein the Priest, having baptized the child *with water*, in the name of THE FATHER, and of THE SON, and of THE HOLY GHOST, thus speaks :—In the Public Form—‘ Seeing now, dearly beloved Brethren, that this child *is regenerate*, and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church. In the Private Form—‘ Seeing now, dearly beloved Brethren, that this child *is BY BAPTISM regenerate*, and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church :’ and, moreover, in the previous certificate by the Minister, who saith—‘ This child, being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, is now, *by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism*, received into the number of the children of God and heirs of everlasting life ; for our Lord Jesus Christ doth not deny His grace and mercy unto such Infants, but most lovingly doth call them unto Him.’ And again, in both Forms—‘ We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy Holy Church.’

(In which said Forms the 57th Canon of the Church declares ‘ the doctrine of Baptism to be so sufficiently set down,’ ‘ as nothing can be added to it that is material or necessary.’)

3rdly. In her ORDER OF CONFIRMATION, when the Bishop prays that God will strengthen His servants whom He had ‘ vouchsafed to regenerate *by Water and the Holy Ghost*,’ and unto whom He had given the forgiveness of all their sins.’

4thly. In her CATECHISM, which teaches that ‘ *in Baptism* we are made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven’ . . . that ‘ Baptism is a *Sacrament* generally necessary to salvation’ . . . that ‘ Sacrament means an outward and visible sign of an *inward and spiritual grace given unto us*, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means *whereby* we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof ;’ and that ‘ the inward and

spiritual grace in Baptism is a *death unto sin*, and a *new birth unto righteousness*.'

5thly. In her ARTICLES, viz., in her TWENTY-FIFTH ARTICLE—'Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's professions, but rather they be certain *sure* witnesses, and *effectual* signs of grace and God's good will towards us, *by the which* He doth work invisibly in us.' And again, in her TWENTY-SEVENTH ARTICLE—'Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men may be discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, *whereby* as by an instrument they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church;'

Now, WE, the undersigned, members of the Church of England, accepting without reserve these distinct declarations of her doctrine (denying also that her deliberate and unambiguous expressions in the actual ministration of the Sacrament of Baptism are to be taken in a qualified or uncertain sense), and holding THAT ORIGINAL SIN IS REMITTED TO ALL INFANTS BY SPIRITUAL REGENERATION, THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF THE MERITS OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST IN AND BY THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM, which doctrine we, together with the whole Church, individually affirm whenever in the recital of the Nicene Creed we 'ACKNOWLEDGE ONE BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS,' do hereby solemnly repudiate and protest against the said judgment of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council; and do appeal therefrom unto a free and lawful Synod of the Church of England, when such Synod may be had;—

Because—While the Judicial Committee exclude from their abstract of Mr. Gorham's doctrine (on which abstract alone they decide) all notice of the specific errors asserted by him in the afore-cited passages—their judgment sanctions the acceptance in an hypothetical and unreal sense of the plain declarations of the Church—suggests contradictory interpretations of her doctrines, and requires institution to a benefice with cure of souls of a Priest who professes doctrines utterly inconsistent with the Sacramental character of Baptism, and subversive of a fundamental article of Faith.

And *Because*—through this decision touching doctrines of the Church, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council do (notwithstanding their formal disclaimer of 'any authority to settle matters of Faith'), practically exercise in spiritual matters a jurisdiction for which they are utterly incompetent, and which never has been, nor ever can be, confided to them by the Church.

Besides this Protest, the meeting adopted a petition to the Queen, asking that all questions touching doctrine might be referred to the spirituality of the Church of England,

and that those impediments might be removed which now obstructed the exercise of the ancient synodical functions of the Church. In another petition the English bishops were asked to express their desire for the meeting of the Church in Synod, or at least to make some general declaration in favour of the impugned truth. The fourth address consisted of a vote of thanks to the bishops of the Church of Scotland for their synodical declaration on the subject of the doctrine of Baptism. Lastly there was an appeal to all members of the English Church at home and abroad for sympathy and assistance.

Two days after the meeting Archbishop Sumner received a deputation at Lambeth, who presented to him the address to the English bishops. He was courteous, but observed that he had the misfortune of disagreeing with some of the sentiments embodied in the address. He could have wished that the language of the address had been less positive and had made more allowance for differences of opinion. But however courteous he might be, the well-known opinions of the Archbishop were not calculated to reassure those whom recent events had inclined to defection towards Rome. Besides there were some of these to whom the meeting and everything else intended to relieve the Church of England of moral complicity in the decision of the Privy Council were unwelcome. They had, as has been said, been disposed from the first to see in that decision a sign from heaven, bidding them no longer remain within the English Church. Keble had observed this tendency on March 19th—the day on which he and twelve others had signed the nine resolutions; and in a public letter of his, bearing that date, had warned his friends, not only against ‘amusing themselves, as if nothing sacred were in jeopardy,’ but also against ‘losing patience and rushing fretfully on, as though it were our duty to make the worst of everything.’

The class of people of whom Keble here speaks were those who felt most keenly the second great difficulty to which allusion has been made—that is, not so much the

serious nature of the error which was sanctioned by the Judicial Committee, as the fact that in virtue of the Royal Supremacy such a tribunal should be allowed to deal with such a question at all. Two or three months before the Judicial Committee gave its decision, the title of the Committee to do so had, as we have seen, been anxiously discussed ; and anxiety had gradually deepened into feelings and convictions hostile to the claim of the Church of England to be a part of the Church of Christ.

A serious symptom of the impending difficulties appeared in 'A First Letter on the Present Position of the High Church Party in the Church of England, by the Rev. W. Maskell,' which was published in February, 1850, some three weeks before the decision of the Judicial Committee. Mr. Maskell's accomplishments as a Liturgical scholar, and his position as Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter, invested this letter with an undeniable importance ; and great was the surprise when it was discovered that the writer contended not only that the Judicial Committee was obviously disqualified by the law of Christ from dealing with questions of faith and discipline, but also that such a Court was nothing more than the necessary organ of the Royal Supremacy as established by the statutes of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. The effect of Mr. Maskell's pamphlet was to increase the widespread uneasiness : it was now definitely asked whether the changes which had been assented to on the part of the Church of England three centuries ago were such as to forfeit her claim to be a part of the Church of Christ ? Mr. Maskell's objection was directed not only against the constitution of the Judicial Committee, as a Court consisting of a majority of laymen who might or might not be Christians ; he would have objected to it just as decidedly had it been composed exclusively of bishops. He protested equally against Bishop Blomfield's proposal for a new Court, on the ground that the real source of anxiety was not 'the character, the qualifications, or the position of the individuals' comprising the Court, so much as 'the source whence the Court derived its jurisdiction.'

My dear fr

Only can him to say how shocked
I am to meet you such scraps, which, as a whole
must be utterly unintelligible. I began writing
thinking that I had something to write. But I found that
to set some minds at rest. But I found that
I needed more knowledge & more books, & that
to satisfy myself that I was less accurate; &
more books gave me more things to say, & so
the more is re-written, & some re-arranged &
all is confusion. But if you find nothing to
object to, or alter any thing you do, this will
be all well, please God.

Ever your grateful & aff.
D.P.

FACSIMILE OF ONE OF DR. PUSEY'S LETTERS

This letter was addressed to the Rev. John Keble in March, 1850, and accompanied the manuscript of Dr. Pusey's work on the Royal Supremacy.

It is characteristic in the size of the paper, the abbreviations, the absence of address and date, and the signature by initials only.



No merits in its constitution could warrant allegiance to a Court which derived its authority from the State¹. Another pamphlet on the same lines, written by the Rev. T. W. Allies², was based, as he tells us, among other authorities, on Suarez's well-known attack on the Church of England³. Mr. Allies' pamphlet does not, as the accomplished author was sanguine enough to think, 'make minced-meat of the Anglican position⁴.' It certainly says what there is to be said—and indeed something more—on the Roman side of the question in the best and most trenchant way.

It was with a view to meeting such objections as Mr. Maskell's and the condition of thought which they indicated, that Pusey, some time before the decision of the Privy Council, had begun a work on the Royal Supremacy; and the discussions of the London Church Union at which he had been present had convinced him of its necessity. It was written, amidst his overwhelming occupations, in scraps, as he could manage it; and it appeared, after an interval of three months, at the beginning of May. A letter to Keble throws a ray of light upon the process of composition.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Undated, but March, 1850.]

Only one line to say how shocked I am to send you such scraps, which, as a whole, must be utterly unintelligible. I began writing thinking that I had something which might help to set some minds at rest. But I found that I needed more knowledge and more books, to satisfy myself that I was accurate; and more books gave me more things to say; and so some is re-written, and some re-arranged, and all is confusion. But if you find nothing to object to, or alter anything you do, this will be all well, please God.

Ever your very grateful and affectionate

E. B. P.

¹ Maskell, 'First Letter, &c.,' pp. 57, 58 sq.

² 'The Royal Supremacy viewed in reference to the two spiritual powers of Order and Jurisdiction,' by T. W. Allies, M.A. London, Pickering, 1850.

³ 'De Erroribus Sectae Anglicanae.'

So cited in 'A Life's Decision,' p. 217. More fully 'Defensio fidei catholicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores.' Suarez, Opp. vol. xxiv.

⁴ 'A Life's Decision,' by T. W. Allies, M.A., p. 287.

Pusey wrote as and when he could, in railways and on coaches as well as in his study; and then put the fragments together. But it is possible to separate the portion of the pamphlet which preceded the Gorham decision from that which followed it¹: in the former part he is still hopeful; in the latter he is gravely concerned with the new duties and anxieties of 'this threatening hour.'

Pusey's book on the 'Royal Supremacy' was, and remains, a fragment; though it was supplemented to a certain extent by his later work on the Councils of the Church. It is, however, of lasting value against theories which deny to the State those rights which, with due safeguards, were acknowledged in the early ages of the Church; and it was immediately addressed to those who held that any kind of Royal Supremacy was inconsistent with the precedents and principles of Christian antiquity. Taking his stand upon antiquity, Pusey asks and answers the question, what the Christian civil power may, and what it may not do, in relation to the guardianship of the faith. His answer neither supports the complicated claims of the Judicial Committee, urged with increasing aggressiveness, nor does it warrant those *à priori* assumptions which are made in the interests of the Church of Rome. In controversies of faith the Christian civil power claimed in ancient times no primary authority, as properly belonging to it. If Christian Emperors summoned councils, and were present at their deliberations, they neither spoke nor voted. If Christian Emperors might nominate Episcopal judges to try questions of discipline or doctrine, they were ordinarily not even present at the trial. A priest could only appeal from his bishop to other bishops, or to a primate or metropolitan, or to a general council. If he appealed to a civil court, he exposed himself to degradation. On the other hand, the Christian Emperors had done everything short of formulating doctrine, interpreting doctrinal formulas, and pronouncing disciplinary sentences in their own names. In

¹ The line of demarcation occurs at p. 171, before the beginning of the last paragraph.

cases of appeal, they might and did appoint ecclesiastical judges. They might suspend the judgment of a council respecting bishops accused of heresy, by convoking another council. They might remove a trial from one ecclesiastical province to another. They might summon a council as general and then change it into a provincial council. They might even prescribe the order in which subjects should be handled, or suggest doctrinal subjects to councils, whether general or provincial; or confirm their decrees, or, in matters of discipline, revise them. A general council could even allow itself to acknowledge that nothing should be done without command of the Emperor. Christian princes were regarded in ancient times as guardians of the Creed and Canons of the Church: and they took on themselves, without rebuke, the authority to enforce those Creeds and Canons, and even to admonish bishops to obey them. It was clear that the relations of Church and State, as defined in the preamble of the 24th of Henry VIII., had abundant justification in ancient precedents: and no violation of these relations had taken place until the establishment, seventeen years before, of the modern civil court of the Judicial Committee, which by a legislative oversight had been entrusted with the decision of ecclesiastical cases.

Mr. Maskell had taught or implied that any control over Church doctrine or discipline on the part of the Crown, even though exercised purely through the Episcopate, was indefensible. Pusey, on the other hand, held that no layman, as such, has jurisdiction over matters of faith and discipline, and that every bishop derives spiritual jurisdiction, not from the Crown, or from any superior or independent source, but from his See¹; he therefore maintained that the Crown, in moving bishops to decide spiritual cases, was not the source of jurisdiction, but only the power which put into motion a jurisdiction existing independently of itself.

¹ That this is the case with the Pope R.C. theologians are obliged to admit. The Early Church held it to be true of all bishops.

'The principle,' he wrote, 'which seems to me to run throughout these precedents [of Christian antiquity] is this; that the Civil Power called into action, regulated at times, limited, controlled, enforced by civil sanction the authority of the Church, or restrained it, that it should not act independently of itself, but hardly acted itself directly or usurped the Church's place¹.'

The truth was Mr. Maskell was already thinking of Church history as read by Papal controversialists. He had forgotten that reading of it which is suggested by the career of such Catholic sovereigns as Theodosius or Justinian.

Pusey sent his book to the Bishop of Exeter, who acknowledged it in warm terms. 'Though I have not had time to read so much or so carefully as I wish, yet I have read enough to make me feel that it is worthy of you. Higher praise I need not give to it.' Another copy was sent to Rev. W. K. Hamilton, Canon of Salisbury, whose acknowledgment of it is one of several testimonies to Pusey's influence at this period in preserving loyalty to the Church of England.

REV. W. K. HAMILTON TO E. B. P.

Loughton, Essex, May 11, 1850.

... I was very nearly going to Oxford after the Confirmations at Westbury last Saturday, and mainly in the hopes of finding you there—for I still find, as I have for many years, the best answer to harassing questionings which prey upon one's mind, in the fact that you and Mr. Keble, and Williams, and some of my own immediate friends, are content to be patient.

However, I am not going to pour out any part to you of a very full heart. Written words are bad forms of such feelings, and notes the worst moulds in which to cast them. I would only thank you most affectionately for thinking at such a time of one so unworthy—and to ask you if you would put my name to the two Petitions, to the Queen and Archbishop, you sent me. I had only time just to glance at them and then sent them to our Bishop. If all our Bishops were like him: so earnest, so calm, so straightforward, so full of faith and love! I do not feel sure that you quite appreciate him as he deserves. He has been very anxious, and very true, and very busy, about all these sad things. . . .

I remain, dear Dr. Pusey, with great respect,

Yours ever gratefully attached,

W. K. HAMILTON.

¹ 'Royal Supremacy,' p. 162.

Acting more or less in concert with Mr. Maskell and Mr. Allies, was another clergyman, their inferior in literary ability, but with whom Pusey had been most intimately • associated in religious and spiritual work, Rev. W. Dodsworth. Mr. Maskell and Mr. Dodsworth were both present at the meeting at which the Nine Resolutions were signed : the latter subscribed them ; the former, probably from thinking that any expedient of the kind was inadequate or too late, did not do so. Mr. Dodsworth's sermons were becoming increasingly indicative of an unsettled state of mind, and, as was inevitable, they communicated this unsettlement to members of his congregation, particularly to the Sisters of Park Village who attended his church.

‘What shall I do,’ wrote Pusey to Keble, ‘if Dodsworth continues this sort of sermon? My children at the Sisterhood were so distressed at the last about Balaam, and the appeal to the young to think and act for themselves, that the Mother begged not to go there again. I suggested that they should try one more Sunday ; but what if these sermons continue? One should not wish them to stay at home, and yet to pass Christ Church would be very painful.’

‘It is very sad,’ replied Keble, ‘about Dodsworth. I think he is more angry with me than with you. His letter of withdrawal from the Church Union, which was read to-day, went out of its way to be sharp upon that poor letter of mine in the *Guardian*, and Maskell, in a way, countersigned it. . . . I wish the Sisters could stop their ears or read their Bibles during the sermon. It would be the best thing. But I fear they cannot all be depended on for doing it. . . . In so many there would probably be some who would not or could not do it. Would it be wrong to make a distinction, and let them stay who might be trusted not to attend to the sermon, while the others were kept at home or went somewhere else? I really don't see that for a sort of punctilio, any should be allowed to stay and get unsettled.’

In a pamphlet on ‘The Gorham case briefly considered,’ and again in a sermon preached on Low Sunday, Mr. Dodsworth had laid especial stress on what he conceived to be the inadequacy of the restatement of the doctrine of Baptismal Grace which was proposed by Pusey. Mr. Gorham had denied that original sin was remitted to all infants in Holy Baptism, on the ground that all were not ‘worthy receivers,’ as not being all ‘already in God's grace and favour.’ Pusey thought that this error which the

Court had sanctioned would be adequately met by stating that 'the remission of original sin to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism is an essential part of the article, "One Baptism for the remission of sins"¹.' Mr. Dodsworth complained that the doctrine of Baptismal Grace meant much more than the remission of original sin; that its great and positive effect was the gift of membership in Christ, as the Church Catechism teaches. To this Pusey agreed with all his heart: but he pleaded that the statement of which Mr. Dodsworth complained was devised to meet the truth directly impugned. Another point of difference between Pusey and the minds whom Mr. Dodsworth represented, was the view which was to be taken of a not inconsiderable section of the supporters of the Judgment.

'Many,' wrote Pusey, 'not the least devout and earnest of the so-called Low Church, are not opposing the truth of Baptismal Regeneration, but an untrue imagination of it. . . . The question which they suppose to be at issue is not, I am persuaded, as to the real grace of the Sacrament, but as to the *actual* change in the infant's soul, and the need of any further change, by which the grace imparted in Baptism may actually take up all the powers of the man, and being continually enlarged and renewed, may conform the whole soul to the mind of God².'

All such language appeared to Mr. Dodsworth to be of the nature of a temporizing compromise with error; and he desired some statement which should summarily force Low Churchmen either to accept the Catholic doctrine unhesitatingly and in its fullness, or to leave the communion of the Church of England.

This painful difference between those who had been attached friends may be studied in the postscript to Pusey's book on the Royal Supremacy; but it was made far more emphatic by the public Letter which Mr. Dodsworth addressed to Pusey on the 7th of May, 'on the position which he has taken in the present crisis.' This Letter was accom-

¹ Nine Resolutions, res. No. 2. Pusey afterwards recognized that, although theologically adequate, this statement was insufficient to quiet

unsettled minds. Letter to *Guardian* of June 19, 1850.

² 'Royal Supremacy,' pp. 220, 221, postscript.

panied by a private note, full of the old deference and affection, and lamenting the necessity for a further statement of disagreement with one who had been so loved and trusted. But the public Letter taunted Pusey with failing to assist his friends at a critical moment; one paragraph in particular contained some non-relevant charges, partly exaggerated but partly true, which were well calculated to increase the difficulties of Pusey's position. The passage runs as follows:—

‘I must add one word on the grief and surprise which it has occasioned me, and many others besides me, that *you* should have taken this line in our present difficulties. You have been one of the foremost to lead us on to a higher appreciation of that “Church system,” of which sacramental grace is the very life and soul. Both by precept and example you have been amongst the most earnest to maintain Catholic principles. By your constant and common practice of administering the sacrament of penance; by encouraging everywhere, if not enjoining, auricular confession, and giving special priestly absolution; by teaching the propitiatory sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, as applicatory of the one sacrifice on the cross, and by adoration of Christ Really Present on the altar under the form of bread and wine; by your introduction of Roman Catholic books “adapted to the use of our Church”; by encouraging the use of rosaries and crucifixes, and special devotions to our Lord, as e.g. to His Five Wounds; by adopting language most powerfully expressive of our incorporation into Christ, as e.g. “our being inebriated by the Blood of our Lord”; by advocating counsels of perfection, and seeking to restore, with more or less fullness, the conventual or monastic life;—I say, by the teaching and practice, of which this enumeration is a sufficient type and indication, you have done much to revive amongst us the system which may be pre-eminently called “SACRAMENTAL.” And yet now, when, by God’s mercy to us, a great opportunity has occurred, of asserting and enforcing the very keystone of this system, and apart from which the whole must crumble away—forgive me for speaking so plainly—you seem to shrink from the front rank. You seem ready to hide yourself under soft assertions of truths, “which,” it is said, “not six men in the Church of England will be found to deny,” and behind ambiguous statements which can be subscribed in different senses¹.

With regard to this line of attack, it is perfectly true that Pusey, who had done so much to restore Sacramental teaching, had not taken up exactly such a position against

¹ ‘A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., &c.,’ by W. Dodsworth, M.A., pp. 16, 17.

the Gorham judgment as Mr. Dodsworth and his more impetuous friends desired. But he had good reasons for the course he had adopted. He did not share the exaggerated estimate of the error of the Judicial Committee, nor did he believe that the Low Churchmen, whose views the Court had sanctioned, were as widely removed from the Catholic position as was supposed. As he observed afterwards at Freemasons' Hall, and with reference to Mr. Dodsworth's criticisms, the Low Churchmen

'were anxious chiefly to secure three points—1st. That adults who receive the Sacraments unworthily do not then receive the grace of the Sacraments. 2ndly. That it does not avail to a man's salvation to *have* received the Sacraments, if he is no longer living as a child of God. 3rdly. That one so living must by the grace of God be turned back to God, by a true and thorough conversion. And therefore,' he proceeded, 'I believe that peace will be best secured by laying down truly, and in all its depth and fullness, and in its connexion with the Incarnation and death and merits of Christ, the truth of Baptismal Regeneration, but also by laying down the other truth, that those who have been made in Baptism the children of God, must by God's grace, live as the children of God, and those who have fallen from that grace must be restored by a thorough conversion to God.'

Pusey in fact was unwilling, as ever, to insist upon a technical statement of differences at the risk of endangering the real unity of belief which he hoped might exist beneath very different expressions of doctrine. If this was to be regarded as timid and compromising, he was ready to incur the charge.

But the main question at issue, namely that of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in connexion with the Royal Supremacy, developed other points of divergence between Pusey and his opponents. In their discontent with the Royal Supremacy, they were more and more inclined towards the supremacy of the Pope; and thus they became sensitively alive to any Anglican infractions of that theory of jurisdiction which had been developed by canonists as a pendant or corollary to the Papal supremacy. The question which they now raised was, under what authorization were private confessions received and absolutions given in the Church of England? Pusey was selected as 'the person to be publicly addressed' on this subject, on account of his position in the

Church, his acknowledged learning, and his long practice of hearing confessions in various dioceses. A joint letter was addressed to him by Mr. Allies, Mr. Dodsworth, and Mr. Maskell. They argued—practically assuming the Papal theory—that the act of remitting sin upon confession was not only an exercise of the power of Orders, but also implied jurisdiction; they asserted that by the continuous practice of the Church this jurisdiction could only be delegated by a bishop through an act distinct from that of Ordination. On this ground they proceeded to challenge the validity of the absolutions which had been given by Pusey and others in several dioceses, without any recognition of the necessity for such a delegation of jurisdiction. They observed, ‘with reluctance and sorrow,’ that if their premises are right, ‘it would follow likewise that the vast majority of those persons to whom you and others have given absolution in this manner are still, so far as the effect of any such absolutions is concerned, under the chain of their sins, because they have not made confession to priests who had duly received power to absolve them.’ Together with this letter was sent an intimation that the writers purposed to publish it together with any reply that Pusey might send.

It must be hoped that the writers of this letter afterwards felt regret at the consequences to Pusey of such an appeal. To themselves it can have made little difference, for their own convictions had reached a point at which it must have been almost a matter of indifference whether confessions were received at all in the English Church, or whether, if they were received, the absolutions were valid; but it might indeed seem that Pusey was placed in a real difficulty by the question which they put to him.

Keble’s commentary on this letter shows that he took a severe view of their action.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Whitsun Eve [May 18], 1850.

If these men mean nothing personal, if they do not mean to stab the Church of England through your sides, they will not be in

such a hurry, they will consent to wait a little, and let the matter be thoroughly discussed in private before they publish. Especially if they have not thoroughly made up their own minds, which the tone of the first letter I think affected to imply. . . .

I almost think that you ought to decline having anything to do with them in this matter, on the mere ground of their unreality.

But perhaps my wrath makes me an incapable judge. . . .

In a second letter on May 25, he adds :—

‘I feel that I am as it were in the same boat with you. But I am quite satisfied with your explanation—and so I think will all be who have faith in the Church of England. I see more and more, that it is little use making believe to go on with those who have not.’

Pusey’s reply to his three correspondents eventually took the form of a Letter to the Rev. W. U. Richards, who had succeeded the Rev. F. Oakeley at Margaret Chapel, and who had always been heart and soul with himself in loyal attachment to the English Church. The position that he maintains is that ‘the Church of England leaves her children free to whom to open their griefs.’

To the ordinary reader this letter might appear at first sight an undigested mass of out-of-the-way learning directed to the establishment of a point which could only interest the mind of a schoolman. In reality, Pusey never in his life wrote anything more practical in its drift. It is, in fact, a statement of the whole question of Absolution from the point of view of the Primitive Church, as distinct from the mediæval theories in which his correspondents were entangled. The only questions with which he concerns himself are, first, whether the Church of England leaves the Power of the Keys in the hands of her presbyters, without restriction, so that they may use it freely for all who seek their ministry; and secondly, whether she is justified in doing so. He answers both questions affirmatively.

The first is proved from the words in the Communion Office, ‘Let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God’s Word, and open his grief.’ This is the language which the Church of England puts into the mouth of every parish priest; and the point to be determined is, who is meant by ‘some other minister’?

Mr. Allies and his friends contended that in 1548, the date of the earliest use of this language, the words would have meant what they had meant before that date, namely, some priest who had been appointed by the Bishop for that diocese or district, so that, in fact, the Church of England does not leave her people free to choose their own spiritual advisers. Pusey traverses this contention on three grounds. He shows at length, and with great success, that jurisdiction, even before 1548, was by no means only exercised when delegated by a Bishop; that, in 1548, the Church of England, by making confession optional instead of compulsory, tacitly abolished any mediæval rules which might compel Christians to resort to a specified spiritual adviser; but that, had this been otherwise, there is no reason for the arbitrary selection of 1548 as the only date at which the sense which the Church attaches to these words can be really ascertained, since she has made them her own on four subsequent occasions, and in circumstances which render impossible the mediæval gloss imposed upon them by the authors of the joint letter.

But then the second question arises whether the Church of England was justified in granting this larger liberty to her children. Mr. Allies had said that for fifteen hundred years there was no trace of the exercise of the absolving power in virtue of Ordination only; that it was always exercised immediately by the Bishop or by priests who were specially appointed by him. But when he appeals to the dealing of St. Cyprian with the lapsed, Pusey shews that Mr. Allies confuses public release from excommunication with the private exercise of the Power of the Keys. He shews further that there were no canons, either general or provincial, for 1,200 years, which imposed restrictions on the making or receiving of private confessions; that in early times *private* confession was carried on without being subject to any regulations; that, setting aside the forged Decretals, the first limitation of freedom by Urban II. in 1087 is accompanied by an acknowledgment that this limitation involved a change in the received discipline.

He argues that the theory on the subject advocated by Mr. Allies, and accepted in the modern Roman Church, dates only from the positive rule enacted by the Lateran Council in 1215. Upon that Council, and not upon any earlier authorities, was based the language of English mediæval bishops, and indeed the general penitential system which the Church of England in the sixteenth century set aside in favour of that which had preceded it.

But Mr. Allies' position on the subject was not so much based on historical precedent, as on an abstract theory, derived largely from Suarez, respecting what may be conceived to be best or needful for the spiritual well-being of the Church, as distinct from what may be shown to have been her practice in early centuries. Here Pusey touches one of the principles which separated him from minds like Mr. Allies, which were tending towards a system, founded largely, as is the Roman, on abstract and *à priori* considerations. 'The force,' he says, 'of abstract principles in matters of religion is to explain what we already know, to remove objections founded upon reason, *not to be the foundation of any article of faith or practice.*' Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, such as Mr. Allies conceived it, was an abstract principle, unwarranted by primitive precedent, and adopted as an obvious corollary of the gradually developing doctrine of papal supremacy. If the Pope was the supreme monarch of the Church, all jurisdiction must flow from him; and bishops, who presumably derive their jurisdiction from him, must see that priests under them also exercise no spiritual powers except in virtue of the jurisdiction which flows from the Pope through themselves. Pusey extracts for examination from Mr. Allies' letter and pamphlet eleven samples of abstract statements which belong to, if they do not presuppose, this primary assumption; the real account of jurisdiction, as he contends, is much simpler. Jurisdiction means no more than lawful authority, which even Roman theologians of high name believed to be given to presbyters at their ordination. Jurisdiction, as exhibited in the canons of the Primitive

Church, is not so much delegation of a new faculty, as a rule of order, intended to prevent that confusion which must ensue, if the exercise of all ministerial duties were entirely left to the discretion of individual bishops and presbyters.

Besides its historical and theological value, this remarkable pamphlet contains some pages of personal interest. Mr. Allies and his co-signatories had alleged that Pusey had exercised his priestly authority in a manner which would, if known, have been against the will of both parish priests and bishops. This leads Pusey to make a statement which may here be reproduced:—

'It is now [1850] some twelve years, I suppose, since I was first called upon to exercise this office. The more earnest preaching and teaching of repentance, which began in Oxford about 1835, drove people to look for a remedy for post-baptismal sin. The grievousness of "deadly sin, willingly committed after Baptism" (Art. 16), had been dwelt upon; but no other remedy pointed out than repentance proportioned to the sin, that so it might be washed out by the Blood of Christ. But persons' consciences needed some present comfort. They could not "quiet" them for themselves. They found the peace they longed for in the teaching of their Prayer-book. God taught them through it. The Church spoke to them by a "living voice"; for God made her words live in their ears and in their heart. In this place, as you know, we are under no Bishop. There is no jurisdiction. The Colleges are extra-parochial; the University is exempt from Episcopal jurisdiction. Here, as you would suppose, there must be many tender hearts, anxious about their salvation, to minister to, and here has been my chief ministry to souls in this way. Then also priests came to me, who are plainly under no jurisdiction; many, because having been asked to receive the confessions of others, the office of ministering to these made them think the more that they themselves needed the same remedy. In like way, when residing elsewhere, I could not but conceive myself included in the Church's words, "or some other"; and so, when any came to me, I ministered to them. But not having a parochial cure, I have not led others to Confession. I felt, too, that God's work is deeper than man's. Except before the University, in which I was preaching on the comforts for the penitent, I have preached repentance, review of life, rather than confession and absolution, because the soul must first feel itself wounded, before it can look for a cure; the heart must be broken first, before it can be bound up¹.'

¹ 'The Church of England leaves her children free to whom to open their griefs.' A Letter to the Rev.

W. U. Richards, by E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford, Parker, &c., 1850, pp. 143, 135.

A lengthy postscript was added to this letter in consequence of what looks like a personal attack on Pusey's conduct with regard to hearing confessions, which was made by Mr. Maskell after he had become a Roman Catholic. It concludes with the following indignant remonstrance against the action of his correspondent :—

‘One gainer there is in all these unseemly contests. It is not the Church of Rome ; it is not truth ; it is not holiness ; it is not love ; it is not the kingdom of God and His righteousness. It is he whose desire it is to have truth evil-spoken of ; on whose kingdom Confession, and every other means of holiness, makes an inroad ; who puts scoffing into the mouths of the profane, and delights to find occasion for it. For one whom Mr. Maskell will unsettle by such instruments as these, he will make private confession odious to a hundred, and give occasion to scoffing to a thousand, who will read his attack as it is commented upon in newspapers, and will jest profanely at priests and priestcraft¹.’

Mr. Maskell's and Mr. Dodsworth's pamphlets were read generally, and especially by high authorities of the Church of England. The Episcopal action which was taken in consequence with the hope of destroying Pusey's influence, did nothing but weaken the English Church at this juncture. No doubt with the best intentions, the Bishops played into the hands of those who were urging to secession.

¹ ‘The Church of England leaves her children free, &c.,’ Postscript, pp. 292, 293.

CHAPTER XI.

PROTEST ON THE ROYAL SUPREMACY—PROPOSED ANTI-
ROMAN DECLARATION—DECLARATIONS OF LOYALTY
TO THE ENGLISH CHURCH BY PUSEY AND KEBLE—
SECESSIONS OF ARCHDEACON MANNING AND R. I.
WILBERFORCE.

1850.

THESE personal controversies, unpleasant as they were, were really subordinate to another question of wider anxiety. The danger of division among those who had hitherto acted together in defence of Church principles seemed imminent. Eventually it was averted by the general acceptance of Pusey's guidance.

It will be remembered that the speeches which were made at the great meeting in St. Martin's Hall on July 23 had pledged some of the speakers to further measures with regard to the Royal Supremacy: and one result of them was made public within a month in the shape of an important document.

DECLARATION TOUCHING THE ROYAL SUPREMACY IN MATTERS ECCLESIASTICAL.

Whereas it is required of every person admitted to the order of Deacon or Priest, and likewise of persons admitted to ecclesiastical offices or academical degrees, to make oath that they abjure all foreign jurisdiction, and to subscribe the three Articles of Canon xxxvi., one whereof touches the Royal Supremacy :

And whereas it is now made evident by the late appeal and sentence in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, and by the judgment of all the courts of common law, that the Royal Supremacy, as defined and established by statute-law, invests the Crown with a power of hearing and deciding in appeal all matters, howsoever purely spiritual, both of discipline and doctrine :

And whereas to give such power to the Crown is at variance with the Divine office of the Universal Church, as prescribed by the law of Christ :

And whereas we, the undersigned Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, at the time of making the said oath and subscription, did not

understand the Royal Supremacy in the sense now ascribed to it by the courts of law, nor have until this present time so understood it, neither have believed that such authority was claimed on behalf of our Sovereigns :

Now we do hereby declare :—

1. That we have hitherto acknowledged, and do now acknowledge, the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters to be a supreme civil power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over the temporal accidents of spiritual things.

2. That we do not, and in conscience cannot, acknowledge in the Crown the power recently exercised to hear and judge in appeal the internal state or merits of spiritual questions touching doctrine or discipline, the custody of which is committed to the Church alone by the law of Christ.

We therefore, for the relief of our own consciences, hereby publicly declare that we acknowledge the Royal Supremacy in the sense above stated, and in no other.

HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester.
ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M.A., Archdeacon of the East
Riding.

WILLIAM HODGE MILL, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew,
Cambridge.

Pusey had had nothing to do with drawing up this document ; but he was at once consulted by a great number of clergymen who were asked to sign, and he answered their questions and gave his own adhesion to the paper in the subjoined letter to the *Guardian*, which since its establishment in 1847 had been the organ and the means of communication for the adherents of the Church movement :—

MY DEAR SIR,

Will you allow me to answer, through you, some persons who have expressed to me a doubt about the meaning of the statement on the Royal Supremacy, put forth by Archdeacon Manning, Archdeacon Wilberforce, and Dr. Mill, that 'it is a supreme civil power over the temporal accidents in spiritual things' ? Archdeacon Manning explains it in his letter to the Bishop of Chichester to be 'the cognizance of the form and procedure of the ecclesiastical causes,'—i. e., whether everything has been done in order and rightly, according to the ecclesiastical law. This stands, emphatically, in contrast with 'the internal merits of the case.'

The recent decision has, I suppose, opened the eyes of many of us to the fact that it is, in very many cases, impossible to judge of the individual case without defining and clearing the rule by which the judgment is given. We assumed that the rule was so clearly defined

that it could not be mistaken. And we did not even dream that the Supreme Court could take upon itself the office of a Synod, to define what the faith of the Church is. This, I suppose, is the mind of many of us, especially of the country clergy, in signing this document—to protest that in acknowledging the Queen's Supremacy, we wholly deny to the 'civil magistrate' that authority which we have acknowledged to belong to the Church only—'authority in controversies of faith'; that we wholly deny to the Crown, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, through delegated Judges, or in any other way, a power so foreign to its office as that of judging or defining in the smallest jot or tittle the doctrine or discipline of the Church.

In this meaning, I have myself signed the declaration, and I most certainly hope that it will be extensively signed by those who are bound to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy, not merely with a view to relieve our own consciences, but as the groundwork of ulterior measures for the deliverance of the Church from this intolerable and most perilous invasion of the office committed to her by her Lord.

Your faithful servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church, August 27, 1850.

It can hardly be questioned that such a Declaration, so reasonable in itself, and brought forward under such auspices, having as its aim the emancipation of the Church of England from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and its decisions, would have had much more general support if there had been no suspicion in the air that some of its promoters might, under contingencies that were quite possible, become Roman Catholics. This apprehension was expressed by a clergyman of deserved influence, and belonging to a well-known family, the Rev. W. B. Barter, Rector of Burghclere. In a praiseworthy but somewhat shortsighted desire to assert his own position and put his own loyalty beyond all suspicion, he declined to sign any declaration when he was left in doubt by its promoters whether, if such and such things take place, or are not remedied, a secession might not be contemplated to the Church of Rome. He thought it was time to speak out on the Royal Supremacy. But he insisted that in order to do so honestly or effectively, it was necessary to deal with more than one side of the question. He would not make common cause with any one who left him in doubt as to the ultimate aim of his pro-

ceedings in reference to so vital a point as the possibility of his joining the Church of Rome.

The feeling thus typically expressed by Mr. Barter took shape in the 'resolutions and statement of principles' which the Rev. W. Palmer, a Vice-President of the Bristol Church Union, proposed to bring forward at a meeting of that Union on October 1. The resolutions were of a practical character, designed to extend a knowledge of Church principles and to promote the co-operation of the various Church Unions, which at that time existed throughout the country, with a view to 'Church emancipation.' But the statement of principles entered on more controversial ground. After asserting the Church of England to be a branch of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, 'which has reformed herself, taking primitive Christianity as her model,' the statement proceeds to say:—

'That the Roman Church (including the other Churches in communion with her), having repudiated communion with all the Churches which do not recognize the claims of the Bishop of Rome, and having by formal decrees and other authoritative acts, and in her popular practice, corrupted the primitive faith and worship of the Holy Catholic Church, reconciliation or intercommunion with the Roman Church, on the part of either Churches or individuals of the English communion, cannot, until the Roman Church shall have reformed herself, be effected consistently with obedience to the law of Christ.'

Pusey and Keble were both members of the Bristol Union; and the announcement of Mr. Palmer's proposal at once attracted their attention. They were asked by others what to think about it; and so could not decline the task of making up their own minds. In reply to Keble, who had written to him on the subject, Pusey expresses at the outset his objections to Mr. Palmer's proposal.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Undated, but September, 1850.]

You know better than I the state of people's minds, and judge better every way. I do not like making antagonism to Rome the basis of union. There are faulty and unfaithful approximations to Rome; and yet the general feeling against Rome includes in it so much that we all believe and all love. I do not see why we should not make

faithfulness to the English Church the basis of union. It is so difficult to explain what we mean. People saying the same formula would seem to mean different things. If we speak of the [Papal] Supremacy only, we should seem to ignore everything of doctrine ; if we speak generally, as Palmer does of 'corruptions,' we should not all mean the same thing, and *I* should be thought to mean more than *I* do.

Again, the English Church has never said anything of the kind about non-intercommunion with Rome. Some of our apologists, at least, say that Rome separated from us, not we from her. . . . I cannot oppose you, nor do I, of course, wish you to take my line against your own judgment. But even Palmer, in London, at the previous meeting, expressed himself satisfied with a positive not a negative Declaration. I think that this is strong ground ; that such a Declaration is adding to the Articles of the Church of England ; and what business has a private body which intends to absorb into itself and to direct the whole movement of the English Church, at least for the interim, to lay down as a fundamental Article what the Church of England has not laid down ? . . .

But, as I said, I cannot oppose you, my dearest F., and ought not to bias you. It may be far better that I should keep to my books and people's consciences and leave all meddling with public matters. So if you go along with this plan, I shall withdraw my name from the Bristol Union, by a letter to the Chairman, in order not to have any responsibility in the matter.

Further consideration only strengthened Pusey's dislike of the proposal, and he wrote in this sense again to Keble and also to Dr. Mill. Dr. Mill suggested a resolution expressing love and allegiance to the English Church, 'as reformed in the sixteenth century.' Pusey would prefer to omit the allusion to the sixteenth century. It would introduce a large controverted subject and would repel many minds. Pusey would have as simple a statement as possible ; a positive statement of love for the Church of England, without a negative statement about the Church of Rome.

Keble was at first in favour of Mr. Palmer's anti-Roman Declaration, but he proposed to preface it by a statement of love and submission to the English Church without referring to the Reformation of the sixteenth century. This statement Pusey would accept, but he deprecated the anti-Roman Declaration which Keble proposed should follow. He would be 'hampered by joining in any anti-

Roman Declaration with Biber and Palmer.' He and they would use the words in different senses; but the words which he made his own would be interpreted by their acts. If Keble supported it, Pusey 'could not dream of opposing' him. He 'should simply sit still.' Keble thought that, in present circumstances, there was something to be said for a declaration against Rome.

'I am,' he wrote to Pusey on September 17, 'a good deal perplexed. I own that I am greatly disposed to a *very moderate*, but *quite real*, disavowal of Rome. I think the quiet and true people whom we want to act with us, have a fair claim to it, after what has happened. And if there are any who would be scared away by it, first their adherence must at present be worth very little, and secondly they must be rather going on under a false impression. I have this feeling so strongly that I do not suppose I should scruple [about] it if it were not for your strong feeling the other way. I am sure you must have good reasons which I am not aware of, and I shall wait to hear before I commit myself.'

Pusey had heard that Archdeacon Manning was disappointed with the result of the Declaration on the Royal Supremacy, and that he was already thinking of resigning his preferments. He dreaded anything that would give the Archdeacon a fresh impulse in the direction of Rome¹: and for this, as well as other reasons, he continued to resist the proposal for the anti-Roman Declaration.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Tuesday morning, [Christ Church, Sept. 17, 1850].

Things seem to be driving on to a terrible crisis, and if they cannot be stopped or the crash averted, some will be made desperate and the rest remain hopelessly disunited. If Prevost and I are to part, it will be sad indeed. I wish to do nothing but what will meet with your full approval. I hear on all sides what a crisis this is, determining the direction which the High Church will take. Could you not bring things to a friendly compromise with Palmer, telling him that people who have no wish to Romanize still do not wish to make any anti-Roman declaration, because they would be understood in a sense further than they mean; and so they would not seem honest?

I do not want, however, my dearest F., to influence you. You know far better than I what should be done.

¹ That this apprehension was justified is clear from Archdeacon Manning's letter to Mr. J. R. Hope.

'Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott,' vol. ii. p. 81.

Keble had sent to Pusey a form of declaration which he thought of proposing. It ran as follows:—‘I hereby declare that I believe the English Church, being a true portion of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, to have a claim upon our undivided and faithful allegiance, and that I desire and intend by the grace of God to live and die in her Communion.’ With reference to this Pusey continues:—

‘I fear that some would scruple to say that they hope, by God’s grace, to die in the Communion of the Church of England, because, although they do look on to continuing in her, they could hardly pledge themselves to say that they think that not dying in her Communion would be from being wanting to the grace of God.

‘There is the question on the one side, whether the case of such is to be regarded. On the other hand, one would not wish to mark off any, if one could avoid it. This would be avoided by such a form as I suggested this morning, if you approve.’

A postscript to this letter concludes with the following passage:—

‘The issue of this meeting will determine whether the High Church will break into two or more parties. It will be very difficult to keep them together. An anti-Roman declaration will hopelessly split us.’

This account of the matter had its weight with Keble. It was never any part of his mind to join in any measure directed against Pusey. He was ‘greatly distressed’ by the contents of Pusey’s letter, and wrote to Mr. Palmer ‘declining to agree to his anti-Roman Declaration, and questioning the propriety of any.’ ‘I wish,’ he added to Pusey, with reference to Pusey’s remarks on his own proposed declaration about dying in the Church of England, ‘that you would authorize me to say, if asked, that your scruple to my amendment is on account of others, not yourself.’ In reply Pusey, after expressing in warm and affectionate terms his grief at distressing Keble, enclosed a declaration which he himself ‘would most gladly sign.’ It is as follows:—‘I hereby declare that I believe the English Church as settled in 1662 to be a true portion of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that I desire and intend by the grace of God to live and die in her.’

Then, after discussing several side-issues of the controversy which need not be reproduced, Pusey concludes:—

‘You may tell Palmer that I do not receive the whole Roman system nor the Supremacy; but I could not pretend to sign the same declaration in the same sense as Dr. Biber, who, I believe, wrote a large book against Tractarianism. Pray do not let me distress you. Anything better than that.’

Before, however, this could reach Keble, he had written to Pusey, with reference to the hesitations expressed in Pusey’s previous letter. He also forwarded some alternative proposals for motions at the approaching Bristol meeting, and added:—

‘I am rather distressed about it: chiefly for the fear of our not being together this time. May it never happen again. I am full of sad conjectures as to your reasons, and sometimes I think that it is to spare people who are only in doubt, but who being sensitive would have their doubts forced onwards by such a thing: I should think very much of them. But people who are even now prepared to receive the [Papal] Supremacy are as a point of Gospel Truth, I should have thought, disqualified from the ministry—I do not say from all communion with us.’

To this appeal Pusey replied by the next post.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Sept. 20, 1850.]

It will never be again, nor this time, please God. I may have done mischief by the course I took in London. I am unfit to have the direction. I go along most cordially with No. 2. I wish I knew whether you, on principle, take my side, or whether it is matter of expediency only. Have *you* any strong feeling of preference for any of the four plans apart from what you think is [Prevost’s] mind? If you prefer No. 3, I shall not go to Bristol, but shall withdraw from the Union. I cannot and will not divide against you. And to be there without voting would perplex people.

I should remain on the London Union Committee, hoping that there no such question would arise. It may be God’s will that I should take no further share in public matters. It was my thought years ago. Perhaps it would have been best so. It might have been best, had I originated nothing, but such as those adapted books, but had simply kept to my own line.

All was indeed in confusion. The secessions to Rome, delayed for some months, were now beginning to take place

one after another. Mr. Allies had already followed Mr. Maskell. Mr. H. W. Wilberforce and Mr. Dodsworth were preparing for the same step. Archdeacon Manning's friends were increasingly anxious about him. 'It is said,' wrote Pusey to Keble on Sept. 23, 'that Bennett is to go in a week¹.' Pusey himself was regarded, even by those near him, with an unappeasable suspicion;—so effectually had Mr. Dodsworth's invectives done their work.

'I send you a letter,' he writes to Keble on Sept. 23, 'to illustrate my question as to whether I should notice Dodsworth's statement about my Roman teaching. It dogs me wherever I go. At St. Barnabas², Freemasons' Hall, Torquay, Plymouth. But perhaps silence, and, if I may, doing something for the Church through this book on Baptism—which I cannot write—may be the best answer.'

He continues, after some other matter:—

'Still the hope and purpose to live and die in the English Communion meets these cases more than anti-Romanism. J. H. N. wrote more daringly and vehemently against Rome than any.'

The answers which Keble received to his alternative proposals relative to the Bristol meeting led him to make up his mind: and in a sense which ended his temporary divergence from Pusey.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Sept. 26, 1850.

I am almost giddy with the different opinions which I get, but am more and more satisfied that it will never do to *word* either a Test or Declaration at Bristol on Monday. As to a Test, even such as we have proposed, I see, I think, that it would be illegal. Mayow is quite of our mind, and by his advice partly I wrote to Palmer last night, imploring him to reconsider his form, as going far beyond and against the doctrine of his own book; to meet us at Bristol on *Monday*, and to be aware that one *could* not act with persons who deal in such innuendos as that in *John Bull* as to what took place at the meeting. I hope to cross to Mayow's so as to be at Bristol soon after 12, and God grant all may turn out peaceably and well. . . .

Your most affectionate

J. K.

¹ This, of course, as the event showed, was happily a groundless report.

² He refers to his sermon on the octave of the consecration of St. Barnabas, Pimlico.

In a second letter Keble reverts to the subject:—

I cannot join in any anti-Roman Declaration that I have yet seen, not even in my own, now that I find the terms of it are equivocal. Also I believe that *any Test* would make the Society illegal. I find that Moberly enters strongly into the view that it is an outrageous proceeding to adopt a new Test in any shape after a Society has been formed so long. He says they could only do it properly by dissolving and re-forming. As at present advised I am (1) for the previous question, i.e. for referring both and all the papers to the meeting of officers, &c.; and failing that, (2) for a simple Declaration (not a Test) equivalent to that which we have proposed. If more than this is carried, to retire from the Union, on the ground that such propositions require deeper and more general consideration than they can have in this way. . . .

Ever your very loving

J. K.

To know that Keble was again entirely with him in this day of trouble and rebuke, filled Pusey with delight and thankfulness. 'It was such a comfort,' he writes, 'to hear from you and to feel that I was not to be alone,—*patre orbatus*.'

On Monday, September 30, Pusey and Keble reached Bristol. The issue had to be decided by an open vote in the public meeting of the Union on the following day. A long discussion took place. Mr. Palmer brought forward his statements and resolutions, in a somewhat amended form, it is true, but still in a form which neither Pusey nor Keble could accept. Among Mr. Palmer's supporters were the Rev. G. A. Denison, Dr. Biber, and Mr. Henry Hoare. They were met by an amendment, proposed by Lord Forbes, and seconded by Mr. Beresford Hope, refusing to accept a declaration of faith, over and above the existing formularies of the Church of England. Pusey and Keble gladly accepted this amendment; and they were followed, among others, by Sir George Prevost, Mr. Alexander Watson, Mr. M. W. Mayow, and the Rev. C. Marriott. Mr. W. Palmer's motion was lost by an overwhelming majority; and he and his supporters left the Bristol Church Union and formed the shortlived Somerset and Bristol Church Union on the basis of his rejected statement of principles. Mr. G. A. Denison,

who had followed Mr. Palmer, stated publicly that he had had to choose between duty to the Church, as he understood it, and 'many a tie which he had hoped would never be severed or impaired.'

Pusey had hoped that this vote would be an end of an unwelcome controversy. But, amid the events which were happening, and in the excited state of the minds of Churchmen, this was scarcely possible. A special general meeting of the London Church Union was held on Oct. 15, in St. Martin's Hall, to consider the amendment to Mr. Palmer's proposal, which had been accepted at Bristol. At the London meeting the Bristol amendment took the form of a substantive resolution; and it was met by an amendment affirming the principle of Mr. Palmer's motion at Bristol. It was the most crowded meeting which had as yet been held by any of the Church Unions. When the anti-Roman amendment had been proposed and seconded, Pusey rose. In his great speech, as would happen sometimes when he was deeply moved, he expressed himself with a force and clearness which took the meeting by surprise, and carried all before it. After glancing at the 'censure and misunderstanding' which must inevitably follow upon opposition to a declaration against Rome, he pointed out the evil of such a declaration considered as a new test, which would foment new controversy, would injure that love which is the motive-strength of the Church, and, as proceeding from a small body of persons, could not represent her authority or bind her conscience. Discussing the imputation of unfaithfulness to the Church of England, and the duty of meeting it by positive statements, he pointed out that the irrational and implacable suspicions in which these imputations originated, and on which they rested, could not be remedied by any declaration. A declaration might be as anti-Roman as possible, but it would merely be looked upon with invincible suspicion as the language of Jesuits. He added, 'If the labours of seventeen or twenty-seven years will not persuade men that we are faithful to

the Church of England, words will not. We must await God's time until this fever of fear subside: or if nothing will convince them, death in the bosom of the Church of England will.'

The address was listened to throughout with intense interest. But the words which are quoted above produced a deep impression. There was a minute of hushed silence; and then the meeting burst into loud cheers, which expressed better than any words the love and confidence which it felt for the speaker. At the conclusion of the speech, which went on, in Pusey's manner, to discuss in detail the impropriety of making antagonism to the Church of Rome the basis of *religious* union, the mover of the amendment rose, and in a few well-chosen words asked permission to withdraw it, expressing at the same time a hope that Pusey would give to the world the speech to which they had been listening. He afterwards wrote to the papers to say that his specific object of procuring a declaration of fidelity to the English Church would have been gained by the publication of Dr. Pusey's speech, and that any one who could doubt Dr. Pusey's fidelity to his own Church after his speech on Tuesday must surely be a 'ductor dubitantium.'

Keble had not spoken: Pusey had said all that he had wished to say. But he added afterwards:—

'I have only one regret about not speaking the other day. I wish I had said something about people not going to the Oratory, &c., with itching ears: for I observed that when Mr. Darling spoke of it there was rather a titter about the room, and I think it is the worst sign of the day.'

Here, perhaps, it may be added, that not long afterwards Keble made to his Bishop a profession of confidence in the Church of England, with the same motives as Pusey's at the meeting in Freemasons' Hall. In ordinary circumstances such professions would be out of place: it might be taken for granted that a clergyman meant to die in that part of the Church which was the scene of his labours. But the times were not ordinary: everybody who was

prominently associated with the Movement was regarded with suspicion; and the Bishop of Winchester was never able to rise above the prejudices of his party in his relations with the most distinguished clergyman in his diocese.

REV. J. KEBLE TO BISHOP (SUMNER) OF WINCHESTER.

Hursley Vicarage, St. Stephen's Day, 1850.

MY DEAR LORD,

Very sincerely, but in deep sadness, do I thank you for your kind letter of the 19th. The sadness arises not from any doubt of the course I ought myself to pursue, but from finding that yourself and others, to whom one had looked, under God, for support, should feel doubtful on such a point, and on such grounds. I never supposed, when the 'Movement,' as it is called, began (or rather drew public attention to itself), that its success was to be a test of its propriety. The principles of it seemed to me then, and now seem to me, equally true and right, whether two or three acknowledge them, or two or three million. It seems to me also that if Rome has claim upon us now, she had just the same claim then, and would have, had the Movement been ever so successful—outwardly successful, I mean—for that it has been altogether a failure is by no means proved, and the main visible cause of its seeming failure has surely been the forsaking of it by so many. Not even to them, greatly as I loved and revered many of them, can I give up the faith and convictions of my whole life, which I find only strengthening by what little experience and inquiry I have been able to bring to these matters. Much less can I give up to the voice of Lord John Russell's Bishops and the Common Councils and County Meetings of England. I thought the Scriptures distinctly prepared us to expect that in the latter times especially, whatever men's professions might be, the Truth might perhaps be held really by a remnant only; and therefore though it is a great grief, it is no scandal, to me, to see ever so large a proportion of those who acknowledge the Prayer-book wresting it as they do. I cannot call the system contained in that book a mere paper system: nor can I see how it is not a living voice, so long as it is heard in our Churches, whatever the sermons may be that go along with it, and whether the congregation assent to it or no. The Gospel does not cease to be a true witness to all nations, because many refuse to believe and many are hypocrites; and what Bishop Butler has said of it, as an apparent failure in the world's general history, may be said (at least so I have always thought) of the failure of the Church of England in its more limited sphere. All this (and much more) *for* our own Church—as *against* that which is assumed to be the sole alternative; you know perhaps that I have always greatly disliked strong language, if it could be helped: but my old objections to the Roman system remain, and are greatly strengthened (so far as they are at all affected) by the

apparent course of events. I feel that I *could* not with any faith accept that system, as it presents itself obviously to my mind in the documents I should have to sign. I must do it with at least as great allowances and reservations as Mr. Gorham needs for the Baptismal Service, or as Wm. George Ward needed for the 39 Articles. This being so, I conceive that I do but follow the guidance which I am bound to follow, in abiding, as please God I hope to abide, by the pledges which I am now living under: one of which I understand to be, not to allow Lord John Russell's interpretations in prejudice of the Church's authority in matters of Faith. The unfaithfulness of other persons, be they who they may, does not seem to me to affect my duty in this matter.

By way of shewing exactly where I wish to stand, I will venture to enclose a copy of a Paper which I believe (though it will be signed but by a few) does really contain the opinions or instincts of the great body of my parishioners, who know anything of our present troubles.

One feels of course that with ways of thinking one does not know to what straits one may be reduced: but one must not surely avouch what one cannot believe, though one should be left ever so much alone in the world. But if it please God, I hope that some will be found, of all orders in His Church, to keep the lamp alive.

I try to pray for your Lordship, such as my prayers are—and I earnestly ask yours, and your blessing: being always, my dear Lord,

Your affectionate but unworthy servant in Christ,

J. KEBLE.

Mr. William Palmer made one or two more efforts in the direction of his Bristol proposal, but without any considerable result. The question was really settled, and settled in the main by Pusey's patience and courage: and all over the country hearts that had been failing turned with admiration and confidence to a theologian who, in such circumstances, could assure them in the most solemn terms of his unabated loyalty to the English Church, without descending to those controversial expedients which are more often the language of panic than of knowledge or conviction. It is due to Mr. Palmer to add that he lived to acknowledge in terms not more remarkable than generous the misapprehension about Pusey on which his own action had been based. Writing in 1883, Sir William Palmer, as he then was, observes:—

'I must confess that Pusey's proceedings as the self-constituted leader of the Tractarian party often caused to me very great uneasi-

ness. I shared in the opinions of Bishop Wilberforce and Dr. Hook on this point. I should have gladly seen Pusey attempt to reform mistakes introduced by Newman, and endeavouring to correct, instead of seeming to go along with, the ultra-Tractarian mistakes. I was also distressed by his assumption of a leadership of an organized party; but in the end I became satisfied that the position he occupied was for the good of the Church. He advocated and allowed of nothing that was actually wrong, nothing which was not open to considerations of expediency. He had to control a very uncertain party, open to Newman's influence for some time—a party which was unsettled in principle and might easily be driven into secession. I believe that under Divine Providence his work was overruled to the great purpose of gradually steadying in the faith, and making available for the service of the Church, abilities and energies which if harshly and rudely treated, and cut off from sympathy (as many sincere Christians desired) would have proved a source of weakness to religion, instead of a source of strength, and under these impressions I cannot but regard in Pusey a great benefactor of the Church of England. I should myself have often been in favour of a sterner and more direct policy towards all who shared in semi-Romanizing and Ritualistic opinions, and whom Pusey conciliated; but my own opinions were proved to be faulty by the result; for by mild methods the Church has been saved from further disruption, and retains all the energies which a different mode of proceeding might have lost¹.

These words are a tardy tribute to the wisdom and foresight of the conduct which, at the risk of being utterly misunderstood, Pusey had pursued at this difficult crisis. The present position of the Church of England would be far other than it is, had those who at that moment cared most for her Catholicity been induced to forsake his wise guidance and adopt a plausible policy of protestation and anti-Romanism, instead of surrendering themselves to the spirit of calm confidence and repose with which he was animated.

But the Gorham decision and the controversies it immediately originated cost the Church of England dear. It had already cost her the allegiance of not a few who had been doing good work, and the list of secessions was far from complete. Amongst the others who left her were two, one of whom—Archdeacon Manning—afterwards rose to

¹ Supplement to 'A Narrative of Events,' &c., &c., by Sir W. Palmer. London, Rivingtons, pp. 240, 241.

the highest position in the Roman Catholic Church in this country, a position which his many special gifts and graces enabled him to fill with conspicuous success. The other, Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce, delayed his secession for a few years, although it is most convenient to notice it in connexion with the events that really led to it.

In consequence of Newman's withdrawal from the English Church, Pusey had been naturally thrown more into connexion with Manning than had hitherto been the case. To a looker-on Pusey himself might perhaps have appeared to be more likely to join the Roman Catholic communion than Manning. He did not hesitate to incur suspicion by declining to take 'offensive' grounds against Rome, at a time when Manning thought it necessary to do so. He wished that Manning's Charge of 1845 showed 'more love' for the Roman Church. He dreaded lest in the panic occasioned by Newman's secession it might be the Archdeacon's 'line to keep things smooth.' He wished that if the Archdeacon had to remove stone altars, he would at least publish a sermon on the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It might therefore have seemed that Pusey's inclinations were straying towards Rome, while Manning was a loyal and somewhat stiff Anglican. But the truth was that Pusey's confidence in the Church of England could fully allow him to be just and charitable to Rome, and also to minds that were tending towards her: while an attitude, to all appearance more scrupulously or technically Anglican, might really be consistent with a secret suspicion that the Church of England had no practicable principle other than anti-Roman. Moreover, Manning, while in the Church of England, had that strict theoretical conception of law and authority which, within the Roman lines, made him an extreme Ultramontane, and which, in the primitive as in the later English Church, is inevitably destined to receive rude shocks in contact with the facts of experience.

As time went on, it became apparent that in reality Manning was nearer Rome than Pusey. In 1848, Pusey gently remonstrates with Manning for sanctioning the

printing of Mr. Allies' Journal, and begs him to revise it: indeed Mr. Allies' case, in this and other ways, brought the real and growing divergence between Pusey and Manning into prominence. The Gorham case forced matters to a crisis. All through the spring of 1850, the friends are in correspondence on the common subject of their anxiety: Pusey endeavouring to sustain Manning's hopes, to allay his misgivings, to enlist his energies in behalf of Catholic truth in the English Church, until, at last, beyond the question of Baptismal Grace, the question of the Royal Supremacy came into view. The friends still worked together up to a certain point in preparing a Declaration on the subject: but it was clear that they looked at it differently from the first. To Pusey the modern abuse of the extension of the Royal Supremacy in deciding a grave doctrinal question by such a body of laymen (possibly non-Christians), as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, was a great evil, but an evil which might be remedied in course of time. To Manning as to Maskell it was a note of spiritual death: the body which could permit it must have separated from the Unity of the Church three centuries ago: it seemed to him to throw a lurid light on the true upshot and meaning of the Reformation. The Acts of Parliament which inaugurated the change were read with new eyes; and the Royal Supremacy was now seen to be in effect a symbol of the rejection of the authority of Christ in His own Church. Archdeacon Manning resigned his preferments in the autumn of 1850, and became a Roman Catholic at the beginning of April in the following year.

It cannot be doubted that his example had its influence on Archdeacon Robert Isaac Wilberforce; they were closely connected both in private and public life, and after Manning's departure Robert Wilberforce occupied a position of increasing isolation. His great work on the Incarnation was followed by his work on 'The Doctrine of Holy Baptism,' which appeared some months before the Gorham decision, and four years after by 'The Doctrine

of the Holy Eucharist,' which was at once an elaborate but somewhat scholastic statement of the doctrine of the Eucharist. His mind, however, was all along disturbed by the question of the Royal Supremacy and its bearing on Church authority. The book on the Eucharist had hardly appeared when Keble forwarded to Pusey, by the desire of Mr. (afterwards Lord) Richard Cavendish, some letters from Archdeacon Wilberforce, which showed what might be going to happen.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

April 26, 1853.

It almost breaks my heart to think of such a thing: and I should still hope that R. W.'s truthfulness and industry would lead him to perceive that other portions of the Church have swerved from Antiquity as much as we.

Archdeacon Wilberforce's allegiance was much shaken by the silence of English Church authority after such a decision as that in the Gorham case, proceeding from such a tribunal.

'I fear,' wrote Pusey to Keble on May 1, 1853, 'that Archd. W.'s letter looks as if he were going to give more active scope to misgivings which have been rather like a dead weight upon him, than anything active. Those Resolutions, I fear, were like a sword, edged on one side and blunt on the other. I understood them as simply pointing out the natural course of decline, if the Church did not exert herself. But I never thought that the want of a formal Declaration was in itself fatal. May I write to R. W. as if I had seen that letter?'

'Do not write,' Keble replied, 'to R. W. as if you had seen that letter. You will see in Cavendish's that it is not wished we should do so. What I do desire is to get him to accept the notion that we are all under appeal, which I suppose is the only truthful notion of the present condition of Christendom. But I fear he has set himself against it.'

For more than a year after the date of these letters Pusey and Keble appear to have heard but little from Archdeacon Wilberforce. In September, 1854, he wrote to both of them to say that he had resigned his preferments and was going abroad.

'Were you,' asked Keble, 'prepared for this move of poor dear R. W. at this time? and do you think there is any probability of his continuing with us in Lay communion? It seems to me that such a

thing might be *in rerum naturâ*, but I hardly dare hope for it in his case. How very sad it all is! if one did not know Who presides over it.'

To this Pusey replied:—

'I have been *jam jamque* writing to you many times. I did not expect *this* move of Archdeacon W. For I thought that the paper which he and Manning and Mill had circulated unopposed, must clear his subscription. He tells me this morning that he is going abroad, and asks for prayers as for one whose path is dark. That can have but one ending. Lay communion must gnaw upon the soul. It is a continual practical denial of his functions. Besides, abroad, where is he to communicate? Do you think that you could induce him to stay and work in England? His work has been intellectual hitherto; so that this would be no great change.'

To the Archdeacon, Pusey wrote in terms which show that he still hoped for a reconsideration of the grounds which alone would justify the final step. But argument was now too late. Pusey and Keble both knew what was to be expected.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Sept. 18, 1854.

I wish I knew how to put the matter to R. W. to set him on thinking of some work here instead of wandering. But Prevost (from S. O.) tells me that this movement has been really sudden, occasioned, as S. O. thinks, by more than usual intercourse with H. W. and H. E. M., who never let him alone. Is not the real account of it his constant longing to have everything made theoretically square and neat? and so he takes up with those who make most profession of supplying the want, without too nice inquiry into the truth of their profession. As to continuing in Lay communion, of course one has no hope of his doing so, but in itself, is it not a conceivable position, and one which might be tenable by a man of another temperament? and might he not, if the Supremacy were all, communicate even clerically in the Church of Scotland?

Of the correspondence between Keble and Pusey, and their old friend who was leaving them, we catch a last glimpse in Keble's words to Pusey.

Hursley Vicarage, Nov. 3, 1854.

'I am not in regular correspondence with poor R. W. He is far beyond any appliances of mine. I am thinking of writing to him on one or two topics, for the satisfaction of my own mind, and your note

will help me. One thing I want to disabuse him of, is his assumption that because this step is painful to him he cannot have been moved by his feelings towards it: as if there were no such thing as morbid feeling.'

In fact, when this letter was written, such correspondence was of even less avail than Keble probably supposed. Mr. R. I. Wilberforce had gone to Paris with Dr. Grant, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Southwark, and had been received into the Roman Church on Nov. 1. He survived his secession two years and a half, but before he could carry out his purpose of being re-ordained in the Roman Church he died.

CHAPTER XII.

‘Ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum.’

JUV. iii. 289.

PAPAL AGGRESSION—BISHOP BLOMFIELD’S CHARGE—
LETTER TO BISHOP OF LONDON—BISHOP WILBER-
FORCE’S INHIBITION—INHIBITION WITHDRAWN.

1850–1852.

IN the autumn of the year in which the Gorham case was decided, while there was still much widespread uneasiness and distrust, and secessions to Rome were constantly being announced, the public mind in England was roused to a fever of excitement, which now appears quite in excess of the provocation, by a Bull from the Pope establishing a new Roman Catholic episcopate in England. On Sept. 24, 1850, Pius IX. issued the Bull, ‘Ad perpetuam rei memoriam,’ by which England was constituted an ecclesiastical province of the Roman Catholic Church, containing one Archbishop and twelve Suffragans. This ‘Papal aggression,’ as it was termed, made even cool-headed people almost fanatical. Meetings were held all over the country; bishops wrote letters; clergy presented addresses; laymen made speeches; the press discussed the subject with almost ferocious fervour; and at last a Bill entitled the ‘Ecclesiastical Titles Bill’ was introduced into Parliament, and carried in a moment of controversial excitement, only to become a dead letter from the first, and in a few years to be formally repealed. The public indignation was fed by

very varying materials ; besides appeals to the memories of the fires of Smithfield, of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and of the Gunpowder Plot, it was stimulated by incitements to popular prejudice against the Tractarians. The Tractarians were 'down,' and were 'fair game' for any public man desiring to make political capital out of religious prejudices. The letter of Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, to Pusey's old tutor, Bishop Maltby of Durham, —in which he denounced the 'mummeries of High Church superstition' and the 'laborious endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul,'—helped considerably to fan the flame of popular fanaticism.

That Pusey should bear the brunt of so much of this outbreak of popular feeling as was directed against the Oxford party, was inevitable. He was now, beyond question, the most prominent 'Tractarian,' nay, the most prominent presbyter, in the Church of England ; and Mr. Maskell and Mr. Dodsworth had succeeded by their pamphlets in making him more an object of widespread prejudice and suspicion than ever before. Wherever he went, as he told Keble, he had evidence of the feelings with which he was regarded. Not only did the Puritan and the irreligious press combine to assail him with incessant invectives ; but old friends were distant, and he met with hard words and cold looks in quarters where a more generous and just estimate might have been looked for. It might have been expected that in the face of the growing excitement, and having in mind the trouble and losses sustained by the Church of England through the Gorham decision, the Bishops would have possessed the insight to appreciate the position which Pusey and Keble had taken up, and the statesmanship to control the excitement of unreasoning prejudice. So far from this being the case the Bishops, with one solitary exception, threw the weight of their authority on the side of popular and shortsighted passion.

On two notable occasions the Houses of Parliament have hastily legislated under the influence of religious

excitement. One was the occasion of the 'Papal aggression'; the other was that of the passing of the ill-judged and ineffectual Public Worship Regulation Act. Of both panics it may be said that people and Parliament have become thoroughly ashamed. It is melancholy to reflect that in each case the excitement was stimulated, rather than restrained, by the leading members of the Episcopate.

An excess of timidity has always been thought to be the mark of the Episcopate in the Western Church; and of the Bishops it was said in the middle ages, '*Episcopi in Angliâ semper pavidissimi.*' History describes many disastrous results of this characteristic. Certainly on the occasion of the issue of the Papal Bull this excessive timidity, issuing in panic fear, can alone account for the singular want of judgment displayed by the Bishops. In their terror of Rome they included in a general denunciation not only the Roman Catholics but also the whole Tractarian party—Pusey and all who in any way sympathized with him. The Bishop of Exeter indeed was a noble but solitary exception. He did his best to encourage and defend one whom he recognized as loyally working for the Church of England.

'Pray,' wrote the Bishop to Pusey, 'do not consider yourself under any restraint in preaching in my diocese. I had forgotten that I had requested you in 1848 to forbear. I by no means ask you to forbear any longer. Pray *come to my house freely*. I will not submit to the humiliation of not receiving gladly a friend whom I so highly value, because of the unjust clamours which ignorant or malicious persons may raise.'

Undoubtedly the position held by Pusey may have required some explanation. Yet it would hardly have been expected that the Bishop of London, who had known Pusey for a quarter of a century, the Episcopal assessor who had dissented from the Gorham judgment, should have been unequal to forming a true estimate of the justification of Pusey's attitude. Even he could only intensify the expressions of his own divergence from Pusey's doctrine and practice.

On Saturday, November 2, 1850, Bishop Blomfield delivered his sixth Charge in St. Paul's Cathedral to the clergy of his diocese. The events of the year had led men to look forward to this Charge with unusual interest. Nor did the Bishop disappoint such expectations. The greater part of the Charge is devoted to a review of the Gorham case; and it reasserts, in clear and forcible terms, the Church's positive acceptance of the doctrine of the regeneration of all infants in the Sacrament of Baptism. After reading this part of the Charge, Keble wrote to Pusey:—

'Do you not think that the Bishop of London has done good service by recalling attention to Brampford Speke in the midst of this storm from Rome? He certainly gets on: I do not despair of his approving primitive monasticism, by-and-by.'

The Charge, as was inevitable, proceeded then to discuss recent secessions to Rome; and the Bishop observed that 'the recent decision of the Judicial Committee might have been the pretext, but could not have been the cause of them.' The way had been paved for them, he thought, at least in some instances, by the growth of opinions and practices at variance, if not with the letter, yet with the spirit of the teaching and ordinances of the Church of England. After some passages about ceremonial observances which did not apply to Pusey, the Bishop went on to describe the teaching which, in his judgment, had led people to Rome. After alluding to Pusey's adapted books of devotion, he proceeded:—

'A propitiatory virtue is attributed to the Eucharist—the mediation of the saints is spoken of as a probable doctrine—prayer for the dead urged as a positive duty—and a superstitious use of the sign of the Cross is recommended as profitable; add to this the secret practice of auricular confession, the use of crucifixes and rosaries, the administration of what is termed the sacrament of penance, and it is manifest that they who are taught to believe that such things are compatible with the principles of the English Church, must also believe it to be separated from that of Rome by a faint and almost imperceptible line, and be prepared to pass that line without much fear of incurring the guilt of schism.'

This passage was framed upon—it was little else than

a condensed reproduction of—the paragraph in Mr. Dodsworth's public Letter to Pusey in which he upbraids Pusey with inconsistency on the score of the moderate line which he had pursued after the Gorham decision¹; while other phrases of the Bishop's Charge are evidently taken from the pamphlet which Mr. Maskell had written with a similar object to that of Mr. Dodsworth. Mr. Dodsworth was meditating secession: Mr. Maskell had already gone to Rome, and it was indeed strange that a prelate who had known Pusey so long should have thought it right to judge his real work and motives on the evidence of those who were in such a position. Pusey's name was not mentioned; but he knew, as all the world knew, who was meant, and what were the authorities on which the Bishop of London's language was based. Accordingly he wrote to Bishop Blomfield, and received a letter which at least shows that Pusey was not unduly sensitive in thinking that he was the object of the Bishop's observations.

BISHOP (BLOMFIELD) OF LONDON TO E. B. P.

Cuddesdon, Dec. 3, 1850.

MY DEAR DR. PUSEY,

My time during the last fortnight has been so entirely occupied by matters of importance arising in my own diocese, that I have found it impossible to give to your letter of November 22 the consideration which it required. A visit to the Bishop of Oxford gives me a few hours of comparative leisure, and I make use of it to write to you.

The observations in my late Charge upon excessive ritualism relate entirely to clergymen of my diocese; those which advert to auricular confession and some other points mentioned in connexion with it, have a more general reference; and I will not deny that I had you, amongst others, in my mind, when I wrote those observations; especially with reference to the Books of Devotion which you have adapted from writers of the Church of Rome, and against which I spoke still more strongly in a former [Charge]. It must be, I think, two years, since I laid my injunctions upon Mr. Dodsworth not to permit the circulation of these books in his district; and the use of them in the Sisterhood established in that district is one of my objections to the Institution as at present

¹ As Bishop Blomfield copied Mr. Dodsworth, so Lord John Russell quoted Bishop Blomfield, in his 'Durham' letter.

conducted. Another is, that it should be almost wholly under the spiritual guidance of a clergyman not in any way connected with my diocese. These, however, are not the only grounds upon which I have felt it to be my duty to withhold my approval from the Sisterhood. Its general tone and tendency appeared to me to be towards Rome; and in this opinion I was confirmed by Mr. Dodsworth, who stated to me some months ago that such was his own apprehension. Add to this, that two instances at least were reported to me, of young ladies who were admitted into the Institution against the earnest wishes of their nearest relations.

It is not necessary for me to enter now upon the subject of Confession, as you have no doubt seen the full statement of my opinion upon that point recently published in the *Times* newspaper, which renders any further explanation on my part unnecessary, except as to the single question, whether private confession can be properly made to any other clergyman than the lawful Pastor of the penitent. Upon that question my mind is not fully made up. It is of far less importance than that which relates to the nature of the confession allowed by our Church.

I shall be glad to see the explanation which, I understand, you are about to give, of the matters alleged by Mr. Dodsworth, with reference to your private teaching; which, if his statement be correct, appears to me wholly irreconcilable with the teaching of our Church.

I remain, my dear Dr. Pusey,

Your faithful servant,

C. J. LONDON.

P. S. I return to Fulham on Thursday.

Rarely, perhaps, in the course of his life had Pusey so many burdens pressing on him as in the autumn of 1850. He never neglected or sacrificed his duties as Professor of Hebrew to other claims, however pressing. Indeed, it is noteworthy how, amidst all the press of controversy, he was actively engaged in promoting the studies of his chair, and raising the standard of professorial work. But he had also a great mass of daily correspondence relating to spiritual matters; and he had now to deal, indeed he seemed the only person who could deal, with the profound and pathetic troubles of those who were influenced by the secessions to Rome; with anti-Roman protests, like Mr. Palmer's; with a new and most painful state of things at St. Saviour's, Leeds; and with an unprecedented relation towards his own Bishop. His letters at this time are full of expressions which show how thankful he would have been, as

he said in later years, had it pleased God, to be allowed to lie down and die. 'I am almost,' he wrote in one letter to Keble, 'bewildered with distresses.' In another, 'I am sick of London Unions and their quarrels. . . . It does seem hard work to unite these vested interests. Everybody seems to wish to become first, and everybody to mistrust others.' Again, 'Pamphlets come like hailstones, by every post, and from the hands of friends.' Again, 'Mr. Allies has sent me his pamphlet : I have no heart to read it, unless I must.' He asked Keble one day whether he had better not give up all other work, and confine himself to the duties of the Hebrew chair. It would hardly be fair in such circumstances to regard this as simply the language of impatience : it was indeed a cry of sheer weariness resulting from a convergence of tasks which were fairly beyond his physical strength.

It was, however, in such circumstances that he set himself, at such 'scraps of time' as he could call his own, to write the fourth controversial work which the perplexities and controversies of that year wrung from his wearied heart and head. His *Letter to the Bishop of London*, dated 'the second week in Epiphany, 1851,' is the most complete account and defence that he has given to the world¹ of those features of teaching and practice which are popularly associated with his name, and which had been brought up 'ad invidiam' by Mr. Dodsworth. Step by step he deals with the points which the Bishop had enumerated in his Charge ; adding, however, some others with a view to the completeness of his work. First he notices the use which had been made of the Bishop's observations by Lord John Russell in his 'Durham letter,' 'in order to turn upon a body of clergy, opposed to his avowed wish to liberalize the Church, the unpopularity of the Papal aggression, which his own acts had certainly favoured.' Then he enters upon detail. He had called

¹ The title is, 'A Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, in explanation of some

statements contained in a Letter by the Rev. W. Dodsworth.' Oxford, Parker, 1851.

Absolution a 'sacrament,' but in that lower sense of the word which English divines had constantly recognized. He had termed the Eucharist a propitiatory sacrifice, not as something distinct from the One Sacrifice which alone is of itself propitiatory, but as the appointed action in which the Church on earth pleads its efficacy, as the Great High Priest pleads it in heaven. The objective reality of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist was, he showed, consistent with belief that His Natural Body is in heaven at the right hand of God; but Christ, wherever present, whether in the Eucharist or elsewhere, was, as Bishop Andrewes had said, 'truly to be adored.' If he adapted Roman Catholic books to the use of the English Church, he was only doing what had been done in every period since the Reformation. The 'rosaries' complained of were simple forms of devotion, and not strings of beads; even Dr. Arnold had abundantly justified the use of the crucifix. The Litany, by its references to our Lord's 'Agony and Bloody Sweat,' justified the devotions in reference to our Lord's Five Wounds; and Archbishop Cranmer had used the word 'inebriate,' which Pusey's critics so greatly objected to, when describing the spiritual joy and forgetfulness of earthly cares and troubles in communion with God. As for counsels of perfection, Pusey had not used the expression; but the truth conveyed by it,—that there are higher forms of service and devotion to which all are not called, but which are a source of the highest blessedness and joy,—is the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

The Letter, however, must be read: no summary can give an idea of its theological or spiritual strength, or of the light which it throws on the temper and aims of its author. Pusey states, with absolute freshness, all that in his teaching and practice was made the ground of popular invective; and he claims his right to do and teach all that he avows. He brushes away with a strong but tender decision the misrepresentations of fact or of motive which had gathered around his work and life. The concluding pages on this

subject are of the highest interest : one or two passages from them may be selected.

‘Whatever my sins, of failures, or shortcomings have been, one object I had ever before me, from my earliest memory, to serve God in the ministry of this His Church. . . . I never essayed (as some have said of late) to be a leader of a party, nor to organize a body, nor to act upon a system, nor to direct things or persons to any given end, except the end of all ends, holiness and truth in the fear and love of God. I never sought (it seems to myself strange to have to deny this) to gather persons around me. When I acted, I acted, rather following advice, than giving it. Only on some few great occasions, and those such as called upon others to act, and that chiefly within this University, and concerning it, have I *acted* in combination with others ; and in these cases I was not otherwise prominent, than the station which had been assigned to me necessarily involved. . . . My name (I have once before said) was on no other ground used in the first instance as a sort of by-word, than because, in order to save a pupil from Dissent, and then, to show how deeply the truth lay in Holy Scriptures, I engaged in the work on the Scriptural Doctrine of Holy Baptism, which grew as I went on, until it became a work instead of a tract. The name became a convenient brand-mark with which to designate principles or truths which those dislike who do not know the truth. . . . Your Lordship, I am satisfied, does not allude to myself when you speak of clergymen who put into the hands of members of our Church “books of devotion in which all but Divine honour is paid to the Virgin Mary,” because, as I have said above, I have carefully on principle avoided it, both for myself and others.’

Discussing the causes of secessions to Rome, Pusey specifies two :—

‘The two leading causes, as may be seen from the very statements of those who have left us, have been,—(1) that the Scriptural doctrine of the Unity of the Church did not seem to them to be satisfied by the English belief, that the Church was still one, notwithstanding its distractions and interruption of Communion, or, as it has been said, that “a family may still be one, though its members quarrel” ; (2) that since the teachers of our Church seem to be at issue among themselves upon articles of faith, our Church does not perform the office promised, “Thy teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers.”

‘These, it must be admitted, my Lord, are difficulties, to which there are counter-difficulties, which may well make us not patient only, but grateful to God for His goodness. I mean, that although there is still enough (as I have often inculcated) in the unity of that Faith which was delivered from the first, in the common

Sacraments, in common Apostolic descent, in union in our One Lord, in common prayer, and, I trust, notwithstanding appearances on both sides, in love, we must admit that Unity is not such as it was in St. Augustine's time. Rome gives an adequate theory of unity, although to that hard theory she sacrifices a great portion of the Church, which "throughout all the world acknowledges" the One Lord of the Church. Again, we must admit, all upon all sides cry out, that there should not be this conflicting teaching. While some of us are anxious to come to a better understanding with one another, others are anxious to cast out those who differ from them.'

One more noble passage follows, which has often been quoted, on the then current proposals to put down Tractarianism, as suggested by Lord John Russell's letter :—

'It is worse than idle to talk, as some have done, of putting down "Tractarianism," in order to check secessions to Rome. Such might drive hundreds from the Church for tens; but while that precious jewel the Prayer-book remains, they cannot destroy or weaken "Tractarianism." It was out of Holy Scripture and the Formularies of the Church that Tractarianism arose. It was cherished by our English divines. It was deepened by the Fathers. It was ripened while most of the writers knew scarcely a Roman book, and only controversially. Tractarianism was entirely the birth of the English Church. Its life must be co-existent with the Formularies in which it is embodied. Tractarianism was not beheaded with Laud, nor trampled under foot in the Great Rebellion, nor corrupted by Charles II., nor expelled with the Non-Jurors, nor burnt, together with the Common Prayer-book, in Scotland, nor extinguished by the degradation of the Church through Walpole, nor in America by the long-denied Episcopate. Even the pared and maimed Prayer-book of the Church in the United States still affords it a home; and the sameness of the struggles implies the same principle of life. Tractarianism, as it is called, or, as I believe it to be, the Catholic Faith, will survive in the Church of England while the Scriptures are revered, and the Œcumenical Councils received, and the Creeds recited, and the Episcopal Succession continues, and union with Christ her Head is cherished, and she acquiesce not, God forbid! in the denial of any article of the Faith.

'But this is for others. To yourself, my Lord, I may say (and you will forgive me for speaking thus plainly), *the* remedy for secessions from the Church is her own health and well-being. Sickly trees lose their leaves, and cannot ripen the fruit which they have borne. Whatever strengthens and deepens the life of the Church, binds her children to her¹.'

¹ 'Letter to the Bishop of London,' &c., 1851, pp. 247-259.

Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London was answered by Mr. Dodsworth, who was now a Roman Catholic ; and this obliged Pusey to write a postscript to his Letter to the Bishop of London¹, as Mr. Maskell had obliged him to write a postscript to his Letter to Mr. Richards. Mr. Dodsworth complained that the multitude of words employed by Pusey seemed to have drawn off attention from the 'facts' which Pusey had admitted ; and Mr. Dodsworth thought it important that these 'facts' should not be lost sight of, and therefore endeavoured to bring them back into prominence in a new pamphlet, 'A Few Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter.' In the process of doing this, he restates Pusey's 'admissions' in his own language, and, by doing so, unintentionally exaggerates or misrepresents them. So Pusey has to go over the ground again, explaining precisely what he did and did not mean to say : and this gives value to a publication which might else seem to be only the last word of an exhausted controversy. All through this pamphlet, and especially at its close, it is easy to see how deeply Pusey felt that the bitter suspicions with which he was now regarded had been created by men who had been associated with him, although in different degrees, as his friends.

The Bishop of Exeter did not endorse everything that Pusey said about Confession. But he sanctioned, very practically, the principle for which Pusey had contended in his Letter to Mr. Richards.

BISHOP (PHILLPOTTS) OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

Bishopstowe, Oct. 20, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR,

It is my intention to address a Pastoral Letter to my clergy very soon, in which it is my intention to treat, *inter alia*, the matter of auricular Confession as authorized by our Church, and the right of the penitent to use the ministry of any priest whom he may choose, in order to quiet his conscience before the reception of the Holy Communion. I should therefore wish to defer any *formal*, or

¹ 'Renewed Explanation in consequence of Rev. W. Dodsworth's comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the

Bishop of London,' by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford, Parker, 1851.

authoritative expression of my sentiments on this matter, until I shall so deal with it.

Meanwhile, I cannot have any objection to your saying, that you have been *informed* (as I doubt not, that you have been informed by Mr. Coghlan) by a clergyman of my diocese, that I had dismissed a complaint against him, not being the parish priest, for admitting a party to special confession in order to quiet her conscience before the Holy Communion, expressly on the ground that the words of the Church in the exhortation to Communion gave a liberty to the party confessing to choose any discreet and learned minister of God's Word, to whom to make confession.

I shall be very desirous to have more particular communication with you on the matter of special confession, before I publish my letter to my clergy—because I apprehend that I do not altogether assent to your views—and I shall be most desirous previously to know your views more accurately, and to state to you my own.

Yours, my dear Sir, most faithfully,

H. EXETER.

But the public animadversions of Bishop Blomfield were less serious to Pusey than was a private correspondence at the same time with his own Bishop. It has been seen that the Bishop entered on his work in the diocese with considerable divergences from Pusey's doctrinal position, and strong feelings of antagonism against his method of dealing with individuals—feelings based on a misapprehension about his aims and character. The course of events between 1845 and 1850 was not such as to help him to see Pusey in a more favourable light; and the line followed by the Bishop in respect of the Hampden and the Gorham controversies did not help to bring him and Pusey together. With the Bishop of Oxford, as with the Bishop of London, Mr. Dodsworth's Letter was the immediate occasion of taking any action.

On the day on which Bishop Blomfield delivered his charge, Bishop Wilberforce wrote to Pusey, saying that he had already condemned Pusey's adaptation of Roman Catholic books of devotion, as 'tending to the spread of Romanism amongst us.' He now condemned the general 'effect of Pusey's ministry,' which

'did more than the labours of an open enemy to wean from the pure faith and simple ritual of our Church the affections of many of those

amongst her children, whose zeal, tenderness, and devotion, would, if properly guided, make them eminent saints, and her special instruments in God's own work in this land.'

'Recent instances of perversion' had combined with 'Mr. Dodsworth's published letter' to produce this conviction in the Bishop's mind: and he therefore called on Pusey to give 'some public and distinct answer to Mr. Dodsworth's charges,' together with

'such an assurance that there shall be such material changes in the practices you encourage, and in the tone of your teaching, as shall satisfy me that they will no longer lead any of the flock committed to me as chief pastor of this diocese, to the corruptions or the communion of the See of Rome¹.'

The Bishop was fully alive to the importance of this challenge. He kept his letter, after writing it, for some days before he sent it² and submitted it to various friends for approval. On receiving it, Pusey replied by return of post, insisting that the most operative reason for the recent secessions to Rome was to be found in the neglect of the Bishops to reaffirm the faith of the Church, after the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Mr. Gorham.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

MY DEAR LORD,

Christ Church, Nov. 21, 1850.

I was purposing, so soon as I should have finished my answer to Mr. Maskell, to make a printed explanation as to what I believe on the subjects which Mr. Dodsworth has put together; and, in so doing, to compare what I say with the Fathers and our own divines. I have learnt nothing which I teach from the Roman Church. I believed all which I teach when I knew nothing of Roman teaching, except in controversy against it. I was going to make this statement, in consequence of the Bishop of London's Charge. I was preparing to do so as soon as Mr. D.'s letter came out; but he, Mr. Allies, and Mr. Maskell, sent me that other letter, and since I knew how very seriously that letter would wound and unhinge tender consciences, if unanswered, I felt it a duty to neglect what seemed to concern myself only. When I had finished the answer which I sent to your Lordship, it seemed too late. I consulted some friends, and they thought it was best to take no notice of it; so I was preparing a book on Baptism.

¹ 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' ii. 79-81. Marriott, 'Life,' ii. 85. The letter is dated Nov. 2. It was apparently sent on Nov. 20.

² Bishop Wilberforce to Rev. C.

There are only three doctrines mentioned in that statement; but that of the Eucharistic Sacrifice may take time to illustrate; and, in the midst of lectures, I have scarcely any. I said in the 'Tracts for the Times'¹ (in 1837) that the word 'propitiatory' was accepted or condemned by writers in our Church, according to the sense in which it was understood; whether as something distinct from the Sacrifice of the Cross, as something *in itself* propitiatory, or whether it was meant, in the language of the Fathers, that we, pleading with the Memorials which our Lord commanded, the merits of the Passion, do thereby obtain graces and favours from the Father. In retaining the word 'propitiatory,' as I did in two cases, I consulted Mr. Keble, and added by his advice the explanation 'or deprecatory.' I mean nothing but what Bishop Wilson has expressed (not to name others), whom I quoted in an University sermon, the first on Absolution, which I think your Lordship heard and said that you did not disapprove. . . .

He pleads to be allowed to preach at Littlemore, as had been arranged, on the evening of the confirmation of his daughter Mary. Little caring for himself, he was unwilling to increase the alarm that would naturally be felt if it were known he was absolutely inhibited.

Many of those who have left us are very sore with me because I do not as they do, and am, as they think, the great hindrance to others joining the Roman Church. They sometimes almost ironically thank me for having led them where they are. No doubt they persuade themselves so. Yet I cannot but think that they are glad to think so as a ground of attack against me. Some of them now seem to be making me their chief point of attack. But in one or two cases, in which persons have said it, I have known [it], from my previous knowledge of their history, to be untrue. I hardly know whether in what your Lordship says you were thinking of your own special sorrow: but I may say (for it was a sorrow to me too) that your brother Henry's mind was formed by Newman, that I did but do what I could for a mind already formed, and that he had passed from me (much as he loved me) under other influences long before he left. This miserable Gorham decision had, I still believe, the chief effect in unhinging him. . . .

Upon one subject, I must ask for more explanation from your Lordship. Your Lordship asks me to give 'such an assurance, that there shall be such material changes in the *practices* I encourage, and in the tone of my teaching, as shall satisfy you that they will no longer lead any of the flock committed to you as chief pastor of this diocese to the corruptions or communion of the See of Rome.'

I do not know of any peculiar practices at all which I encourage.

¹ 'Tracts for the Times,' No. 81, pp. 43-53.

Mr. Dodsworth says that he alludes to nothing private in his letter to me. If a person asks me whether there is anything wrong in wearing a small crucifix, in order to keep in mind the thought of our Lord ; I have said that I do not think that the crucifix can be any more contrary to the second commandment than the pictures, which are common everywhere : that what is forbidden is to make a likeness in our own mind of Almighty God, not to represent in some way that form which He took, when for our sakes, and for our salvation, He became Man. I have not promoted the use of crucifixes, except in a *very few* cases, when persons whom I could trust have asked me for them to wear. In my adapted books, I uniformly avoided the use of the word.

In like way, the Rosary is connected in people's minds with the Ave Maria. Apart from this, as in my books, it is only saying certain prayers repeatedly; and one who knows what severe illness is and great weakness, knows how much easier it is to say one prayer often over, than many. The fewer words and the more concentrated the thought, the better they can pray. A child says to its father, 'do, do, do,' and the earnest repetition of the same words, as our Lord Himself taught us, is often the greatest relief and the most fervent devotion. But I have not been distributing or recommending Rosaries otherwise than, in the Paradise, there are forms of devotions called Rosaries, connected with the Passion of our Blessed Lord ; but all which there is peculiar about them is the repetition of the same prayers, which, yet, is no more than the repetition of 'For Thy mercy endureth for ever' in the Psalm.

My preaching (as your Lordship will have seen if you have looked into my sermons) is uniformly doctrinal or practical, but entirely separated from controversial subjects. It is not this that your Lordship wishes altered.

I could give 'an assurance' upon any definite subject ; but a vague promise would only be ensnaring. I have done nothing in your Lordship's diocese, to which your Lordship could in any way object.

I will explain one statement, that your Lordship may not think that I avoid it. I have used the language of the Homilies, 'the Body and Blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine,' because the Homilies use it ; but I have not thought in this of anything physical or carnal, and have warned persons against this. I have not changed from what I said in my preface to my sermon on the Holy Eucharist : that my mind had been cast in the teaching of Bishop Andrewes and Archbishop Bramhall, that I received Christ's words because He spoke them, but the mode of His presence I kept my mind from, as a mystery.

In like way, since St. Augustine says in the name of the Church, 'nemo manducat nisi prius adoraverit,' I have left a statement in one book, of adoring Christ present. But I have never meant to say

anything about a local Presence, much less of the 'corporeal Presence of His natural Body and Blood'; nor have I meant to encourage anything which could be interpreted into adoration of the Host.

Your Lordship will allow me to say that I think that a very exaggerated impression has been given to your Lordship. Everything is against us now. Every one's faults are visited upon us. Lord John Russell, Presbyterians, all who hate the Church, are stirring up the mob against us; and yet if your Lordship had seen in what stillness I preached at Bristol to a mixed congregation of 2,000 people (many poor) you could have seen that the poor are not alienated from us, nor from the Church by us, God forbid!

But Lord John Russell wishes to screen himself by attacks on us; and the unscrupulous press takes the occasion to express its hatred for us; and yet, if your Lordship looks closely at it, it is not us but the clear doctrines of the Church which it hates.

May I venture to repeat what I ventured to say strongly and to write to some of your Lordship's brethren on a subject upon which your Lordship felt strongly, the affirmation of the doctrine of Baptism? In such a troubled state of things as the present, everybody is blamed. The Bishops blame the Presbyters; Presbyters, not of one class only, and laymen blame the Bishops. Alas for both!

But may I respectfully say, that with such a Judgment as that of [the] Privy Council, and such a Court of Appeal as the Privy Council, and the not unlikely further peril of the Faith unless this be corrected, and the avowed intention of the Prime Minister 'to liberalize the Church through the Bishops,'—your Lordship cannot, I am sure, attribute much to a set of books, not of very extensive circulation. I know and have seen and heard in many more cases, until I was nearly sick at every letter which I opened, that that unhappy decision and all which it involved, was the turning-point in people's minds. If the Bishops would but jointly have made a declaration then, such as the Bishop of Bath and Wells put forth, we should not have been in the condition which we are now. I believe that we should have been in a much better condition than we had been before. For such an act would have given confidence as to the teaching of the Church. Your Lordship will perhaps have seen how Dr. Wiseman urged this point and galled people with it. You will be too familiar with the language—'If the Church of England does not teach certain truth on this, upon what does she teach it? The Privy Council declares that she does not so teach. And the Church is silent. She allows it to be said in her name and she does not contradict it.' One said what one could, about the difficulty of the Church's speaking, after having been silenced for 150 years, but one felt that had this been in the time of St. Cyprian or St. Athanasius or St. Augustine, the Church would not have been silent. And now (if I may say so without offence) people draw the contrast the more, and say if the Church had been but as anxious to affirm the truth as to one of the Sacraments, as she is to

resist aggression on her Sees, we should not have been in the condition in which we are now.

All I can do, with a safe conscience, I will do, and I trust that when I have time to make a fuller explanation, there will be nothing which your Lordship will be obliged to think contrary to the teaching of the Church of England, in which I desire, with my whole heart, to serve God.

I beg to remain,

Your Lordship's humble servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

The Bishop appears to have replied in terms which repeated his previous condemnation, and to have inhibited Pusey from preaching in his diocese, except at Pusey, where 'his ministry would be innocent.' Indeed it was a serious crisis, in view of the general unsettlement, that by his inhibition the Bishop should declare Pusey unfit to teach in the Church of England. Pusey at any rate felt it so, and remonstrated against being judged 'upon presumptive evidence'; and begged the Bishop to return his letter. It was understood that the Bishop's sentence meant that Pusey was to remain suspended from preaching in the diocese of Oxford unless and until he gave adequate explanation. Meanwhile Mr. Marriott had interfered; he was under an impression that the Bishop's inhibition had been precipitated by a baseless report that Pusey had been appointed evening lecturer at St. Mary's, Oxford. The Bishop answered Marriott by stating that the inhibition had extended to 'all public ministrations'; but he explained that it was, for the present, removed 'as an inhibition' on the understanding that Pusey would respect his 'wishes.' Apparently he was beginning to understand what serious results might follow from this high-handed and ill-judged action.

At so painful a juncture Pusey naturally fell back on the sympathy and advice of Keble. Keble was especially distressed at Bishop Wilberforce's attempt to distinguish between Pusey and himself, as though he 'did act and teach within the large licence allowed by our Church,' while Pusey did not¹. After reading the Bishop's first letter to Pusey, Keble wrote:—

¹ Cf. Bishop Wilberforce's letter, 'Life,' ii. 80. Keble is not named; but there can be no doubt about the reference: he himself had none.

‘Dogmersfield, Nov. 23, 1850.

‘This is indeed a distressing letter. It has occasioned me many thoughts, whether I and others may not have drawn or kept back too much, to give him occasion to draw the distinction which he seems to do. I am inclined to think I might, publicly or privately, do something towards mending that. . . . God be with you.’

After receiving Marriott’s report of the real scope of the projected inhibition, Pusey wrote again:—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Nov. 25, 1850.

After a long negotiation the Bishop of Oxford yesterday consented to let me preach at Littlemore. So I trust that the bad effects will be prevented. It now remains only, that I know privately that the Bishop does not wish me to preach or do any public act, such as even celebrate or assist at celebration in any parish church, except Pusey. Pusey, he excepted, because he did not wish it to be known, for fear of bad effects. . . .

Keble replied:—

‘Hursley, Nov. 26, 1850.

‘I am thankful that, at any rate, this impulse of the Bishop of Oxford is not made public, and the next, by the law of his mind, must be in your favour.’

Pusey’s first difficulty arose from the vagueness of the language in which the Bishop made his charges. ‘Influence’ and ‘tone’ may mean anything, until we are told what they are intended to mean. In writing to Marriott, who appears to have pressed the Bishop for explanations, the Bishop explained that he had chiefly in mind Pusey’s ‘teaching on confession, his encouragement of persons seeking to establish the relation of director or guide and penitent, as the regular and normal condition; the minuteness and details of his direction,’ stating at some length the Bishop’s own view about Confession¹. Pusey, he repeated, was conscientiously attached to the Church of England. But he ‘had no deep horror of the Popish system’; he was unintentionally a ‘decoy bird’ to Rome. Pusey himself answered the Bishop’s letter to Marriott: since nobody else could have done so. The Bishop, he said, ‘had been very

¹ Bishop Wilberforce to Rev. C. Marriott, ‘Life,’ ii. 85.

'much misinformed as to his private intercourse with penitents. Certainly he never sent away any who asked his advice; he never recommended any penitent to come a second time: if any so came, it was their own doing. The advice he gave was based on experience: he was careful not to interfere with the claims of domestic life, and had never encouraged dependence on himself. If people did depend on him as they did, to keep them from Rome, he could not help it; he could not change their minds. Only a few were technically "under his guidance": many persons who said they were, or who were supposed to be in this relation with him, were not so in any real sense of the word. If he had to reproach himself it was on the score of being unable to give people who applied to him the spiritual assistance they required.' Pusey further asked for an interview with the Bishop, begging him to 'speak confidentially' to him; 'tell' him 'facts or supposed facts'¹.

The Bishop, on November 30, replied, overlooking Pusey's request for a personal interview, and pointing out what he conceived to be the differences between the Churches of England and Rome in respect of confession, and adding: 'You seem to me to be habitually assuming the place and doing the work of a Roman confessor, and not that of an English clergyman.' Confession, the Bishop held, was allowed in cases of spiritual distress; it was a relief to human nature, but had no sacramental character². The present private inhibition must continue until Pusey's answer to Mr. Dodsworth was published. Pusey's reply is little more than a repetition of the argument of the 'Letter' which he was preparing; and he renewed, but in vain, his request for a private interview.

So matters stood until the end of February, 1851, when Pusey had finished the defence for which Bishop Wilberforce had asked, in the form of his Letter to the Bishop of London and its appendix. When sending this publication to the Bishop, Pusey offered to call on him, in order to make any

¹ See the text of this letter in the 'Life of Wilberforce,' ii. 87-89.

² 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' ii. 90.

further explanations which the Bishop might require. In a short note, the Bishop declined the proposed interview.

‘I fear,’ wrote Pusey to Keble on March 1, 1851, ‘that this little scrap of the Bishop of Oxford’s is ominous. I fear that nothing would induce him to own me. He was always afraid of me, from the time that I wrote that second Tract on Baptism. The state of things now is that I have leave to preach at Pusey and perform any private ministration, but, at his wish, I abstain from preaching or officiating publicly elsewhere in his diocese. This, I should think, could hardly last. I am sorry not to be allowed to assist at Holy Communion at St. Mary’s; else it does not interfere with me. Within the Cathedral walls I am in a *testudo*, and may mine as I please. But, of course, it [the practical inhibition] would do great harm if known. And I have been obliged to escape answering as well as I could, if persons asked me why I do not officiate at St. Mary’s.

‘But what is to be done, if the Bishop continues this quasi-suspension? To wait quiet, until this tyranny be overpast? One may say, “Lord, how long?” I suppose that the line of the Bishops is not to throw us over, for fear too many should go with us, and the Courts might not bear them out; not to own us, for fear of the popular outcry. Is it best for me to go on thus, doing what work God gives me, yet secretly disowned and crippled? What the Bishop of O. could do, would not hinder me, for I have more than enough to do, without preaching at St. M[ary]’s. I am more afraid as to the Bishop of L[ondon], for if he were to prohibit my performing *any* ministrations in the diocese of London, this would be felt very seriously by many whose confessions I hear.

‘I should not be afraid of the Court of Arches as to anything in my Letter. I know not what else they might find in the adapted books. The availableness of the offering of the Holy Eucharist with prayers for the departed, they could hardly condemn.

‘But what should I do? Should I press the Bp. of O. to come to some distinct measure, if he thinks it right to desire me not to officiate in his diocese, or should I acquiesce?’

Keble was as ready as ever with warm sympathy and with a proposal to help as best he could.

Hursley Vicarage, Ash Wednesday [March 5], 1851.

Whether we are suspended or no, we must go on in a disowned and crippled state, as far as these State Bishops are concerned. With *that* one has laid one’s account long ago. If you do not mind not preaching, I should think he would allow the assisting at Holy Communion. It is such an extreme thing to forbid that. I met

him on Monday at Mr. Noel's funeral, and I suppose I should have asked an audience on the subject had I not been fainthearted. Tell me whether it would be a breach of confidence, or plainly inexpedient, for me to *write* to him.

Ever your very loving

J. K.

Pusey gratefully accepted Keble's offer to write to Bishop Wilberforce, especially as a new and dark cloud, big with approaching trouble, was already hanging over St. Saviour's, Leeds. Keble was able to adopt a different tone and attitude from Pusey's, when writing to the Bishop. He was not less deferential to a member of what he would call 'the most sacred Order'; but his greater age—he was Bishop Wilberforce's senior by thirteen, Pusey only by five, years—warranted him in employing the language of almost fatherly remonstrance. Keble identifies himself unreservedly with Pusey on the two questions of Confession and the Eucharistic Sacrifice;—they were the salient points of that invidious paragraph in Mr. Dodsworth's Letter on which the Bishop's charges were based. He assures the Bishop that the censure on Pusey would equally touch himself, nay, 'all our old and true theologians.' If it were authoritatively adopted by any body of Christians, it would go far to sever that body from the Catholic Church. As to the secession of many of those who had sought Pusey's advice in their perplexities, Keble points out that this was inevitable, considering that more persons had sought advice from Pusey than from any other, and that they were previously disposed to follow Newman, and were only held back, if at all, by Pusey's influence.

'Of one thing,' wrote Keble, 'I am quite confident, that if more have passed from his teaching to Rome than from the teaching of any other, more also, by very many, have been positively withheld from Rome by his teaching than have been kept back by any other.'

The Bishop might consider all that Pusey had 'written, done, and suffered in our cause.' Bishops, after all, were very little committed by tacitly allowing persons to officiate in their dioceses; and a refutation, by reason and learning,

would meet the requirements of the case better than 'simple authoritative censure.' Why should the Bishop and Pusey be opposed to each other at all? 'I say to myself,' continued Keble, 'here are two persons who really ought to understand one another: and it seems quite a judgment upon us that they cannot act together on our behalf¹.'

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO THE REV. J. KEBLE.

Cuddesdon Palace, March 14, 1851.

MY DEAR MR. KEBLE,

Your letter has reached me in the midst of an Ordination, which must make you excuse a short reply. I assure you that I never could feel any letter from you to be an intrusion. My position with regard to Dr. Pusey is, and has long been, deeply painful to me. I am fully convinced of the loyalty of his own feelings towards the Church of England. I have no suspicion whatever that he will desert her. I believe that a great part of the outcry against him arises from his firmly holding great truths which the Church of England teaches. I revere his devoutness. With such a man I long to be able to work freely, and to share his reproach. With men *so far* agreeing with him I have worked in my own diocese, and have rejoiced in the late storm to stand by them, shelter them, and bear many of the blows aimed at them. I mean such men as Butler of Wantage, Stephen Hawtreys, &c. Indeed, that no fear of reproach keeps me apart from Dr. Pusey, I think my silence as to our relations, when one word would have stilled the storm raised against me of late, may show. But here is my difficulty:—

1. I believe that Dr. Pusey's 'Adaptations' have grievously injured our Church. Dr. Pusey knows and has known my mind on this matter, and yet has published more.

2. I believe that the tone of Dr. Pusey's spiritual directions, and even of many of his own publications, tends not to uphold amongst us Catholic truth, but to create and foster a tendency to Rome. To *answer* Dr. Pusey's writings as you suggest, seems to me the duty of those who have leisure for theological writing. My call is to action. I see a great danger of a very peculiar form, if young men, some very slightly instructed, some struggling out of gross sin, some loving novelty and excitement, were brought under his spiritual guidance. What, in such a case, can I do, though sore at heart at saying so, but say that I do not wish him to exercise his ministry in my diocese? I believe that his influence tends as directly contrary to Prevost's (whom you name) as possible.

What seems to me my duty now is this: to study thoroughly his recently published statements of his own position and doctrine (in this

¹ See the whole letter and the reply, 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' ii. 93-97.

I am far advanced) ; to consider the bearing of them on his adaptations, and then to give him distinctly and in writing my conclusion. This I will do as soon as the press of business allows ; and in the meantime I think that matters ought to remain *in statu quo*.

I am, my dear Mr. Keble, affectionately yours,

S. OXON.

The Bishop's conclusion took the form of a printed letter, or, as Bishop Denison described it, a volume, addressed to Pusey, which was designed for publication. While the Bishop was writing, the renewed troubles at St. Saviour's appeared to justify some of his grave suspicions about Pusey ; he did not, of course, know what had been Pusey's real relation to them. The letter, or a considerable fragment of it, was sent in April, 1851, to Bishop Denison, who expressed his concurrence in it ; he thought that ' a stronger case than he had thought possible ' had been made out against Pusey. But he added that the consequences of such a publication might be so important that too much care could not be taken in guarding every position. Pusey was in London in the middle of May, and he then heard that the Bishop was about to publish a letter to himself, announcing the inhibition to the world, and justifying it. On Pusey's mentioning this report to Keble, the latter wrote with characteristic warmth, suggesting that, if such a letter were published, it ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged.

Pusey acted on the hint, and wrote the next day to the Bishop. He regretted that the Bishop had refused his repeated request for a personal interview, and told him that he was prepared to defend what he had published in an ecclesiastical court. Hereupon the Bishop sent Pusey the proofs of the proposed letter. Pusey asked permission to show them to Keble—a permission which was at once granted.

Pusey replied to the Bishop without a day's delay. He restated what had been his own rule and practice in the matter of receiving confessions. The Bishop had contradicted Pusey's statements : Pusey asked for some

authority for the contradiction. The Bishop attributed numerous instances of secession to Rome exclusively to Pusey's teaching : Pusey begged him to specify them. He explained at length what had been the real measure of his responsibility for the unhappy events at St. Saviour's. He begged the Bishop to tell him whether he imputed to him tendencies or doctrine which seemed to contradict the Articles. If the latter, the only way to settle the question would be to try it in an ecclesiastical court. If the former, the Bishop might consider how he would deal with representatives of the rising Rationalistic School, or how he could in consistency leave them unnoticed¹.

Keble liked the Bishop's letter at least as little as did Pusey.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

May 30, 1851.

I am deeply grieved at this Cuddesdon document : though I agree with you that he does not wish to be unkind. But he does seem to me most shallow in his theology. One can only pray that it may be somehow overruled for good. I *must* in some way speak a word about it, and that publicly and directly. I am thinking of putting out so many Decades of Queries on some of these important subjects—with remarks after them on such points as may seem profitable—by way of bearing such testimony as I can.

In a second letter to Pusey, Keble added :—

H. V., June 2, 1851.

I have made memoranda on [Bishop Wilberforce's letter] enough to satisfy me that such a writer as W. Law would indeed be able to tear it in pieces most effectually. Still, there is no end of the mischief it may do. I mean if I can to write him an expostulation to-night, for him to get to-morrow evening, in which without treating it as a personal matter I shall tell him my strong opinion of the falseness of his position on three points, Confession, the Eucharist, and penal satisfaction. I shall point out to him that with regard to the second of these especially he has attacked me quite as much as you, and is in fact in the same boat with the Bishop of Winchester, and that it will probably end in as great a disturbance as the Gorham case. In short I shall challenge him, as respectfully as I can : and shall intimate that it would not be hard to answer a deal more than

¹ The text of the letter is given in full, as an appendix to this chapter. See p. 328.

he has alleged on these points. Then if he does not rest it on these but on general tendencies, matters of devotional taste, &c., how hard and unfair it must be: and in either case how very sure to give a triumph to Lord J[ohn] R[ussell] and many proselytes to Rome, and to plant an unnecessary thorn in the sides of those who are trying to make the most of the Prayer-book. I will send you a copy of the letter, but I think it had better go independently of you.

I own to you, his letter appears to me perfectly scandalous in point of learning and theology, yet so adapted, lawyer-like, to the state of men's minds, as to be capable of doing very great harm.

I am not worthy of so great a boon as it would be if one could get him to be quiet. But I must try. You do not mean to reprint either of the three Avrillons, do you?

I expect to go up on Wednesday morning, not sooner: and to be quartered either at Coleridge's or Rogers's (9 Ovington Square, Brompton).

Ever your most loving

J. K.

I wish I was a fairy, to send him a rosary, on which he should be *forced* to say the 119th Psalm (which he calls a choral hymn) every day of his life.

Look at the 23rd and 161st verses of it, my dearest Pusey.

Accordingly Keble wrote as follows to the Bishop of Oxford:—

H. V., June 3 [1851].

MY DEAR LORD,

I do not apologize this time for writing to you, for I feel that I am too nearly and deeply concerned in the matter on which I have to write—your letter to Dr. Pusey, which he has sent me in proof, and your proposed inhibition of his ministering in your diocese. I have not the letter by me, having returned it to him, and for that and other reasons I will not now enter into the personal part of it at all: I mean what relates to the supposed effect of his ministry, and to the tone of devotion which he recommends. A great deal, as it seems to me, might be said against inflicting so definite, severe, and unusual a censure on offences so very vague and indefinite—tones, tendencies, and the like. It may remind some of the process of constructive treason in former times, and of the six Doctors in our own time, whose proceedings did not answer so particularly well.

Unprejudiced persons will hardly think the special charge sufficiently made out: I mean the facts about Confession and the general result of Pusey's ministry. As to the obnoxious Devotions, those who do not like him or them, of course very many, will agree with you, but others will hardly be convinced. Indeed, even if I were not, as I am, compelled to differ from your Lordship on almost every one

of your statements and opinions on these matters, I should I am sure be made very sad (excuse me, I am now in my sixtieth year) by the tone into which you have fallen in dealing with them. But I will say no more of them now: what I wish to do is, most earnestly to beseech your Lordship to reconsider the matter, before you make it a condition of the ministry that a person shall deny all real Presence in the Eucharist except in the faithful receiver. This your letter in effect does. You may perhaps remember that this is the point for which the Bishop of Winchester refused to ordain Mr. Young. I cannot but think that he made a great and perilous mistake, and that it will be an extreme calamity should you take the same line. On this matter the voice of Antiquity is so very very clear, that it will be indeed a stumbling-block not easy to get over, if we, who profess to go to Antiquity, are to be driven to deny this. You quote the Canon of the Mass as referred to by St. Ambrose. The word 'Panem' there is indeed very strong against Transubstantiation. But how can it tell against the offering of the Body, in the sense which Pusey (not 'baldly,' I beg leave to say, but with careful explanation from an old English divine) there attributes to St. A., seeing that, in the same treatise and in that *De Mysterioris*, St. A. had so often declared that after the words of Institution, it is our Lord's Body?

Again with regard to Auricular Confession: with all due respect, I wholly dispute and challenge the legal right of any Bishop or Synod of Bishops to limit the discretion of English priests, as to whom they shall admit or move to Confession in the way now claimed. It seems to me inconsistent with the plain tenor of our authorized books, and I only wish there were any fair judges before whom it could be brought to trial. There are two or three other grave points of doctrine materially affecting the Pastoral care, on which your letter touches in a way to me most alarming. But I will not specify them. My simple object now is, to say to your Lordship what I firmly believe I should have said, had it been any other person, and not one of my dearest friends, whom you were proceeding to censure on the two grounds above mentioned. I am greatly mistaken if there be any one thing that could be done so likely to drive waverers on towards Rome, and to weaken the hands of the most faithful and self-denying among us. Could not some arrangement be made, by Pusey's withdrawing certain books or portions of books, which might save us from such a calamity? I see that almost all the matters you specify as objectionable are in Avrillon, which he does not mean to reprint. O how thankful should I be if some such plan could be adopted! And I do not think you would ever repent it. I ought to add that I write this quite independently of Pusey, and of course I cannot say how this proposal would strike him.

Pardon me, and believe me, my dear Lord,

Your affectionate and grateful servant,

J. K.

The Bishop appears to have answered¹ Pusey, observing, *inter alia*, that if he saw the same dangers in the teaching of the young Rationalistic School, he should think it his duty to deal with it, as with Pusey. The Bishop did not answer Keble; but Keble again wrote to the Bishop. His letter contains one passage which must here be reprinted. The Bishop of Oxford's statement as to Pusey's influence in promoting secessions to Rome is traversed by Pusey's most intimate friend in the following noble passage:—

‘June 13, 1851.

‘My own conviction is that [Pusey] has been the greatest drag upon those who were rushing towards Rome; that such an abuse [alarm?] being inevitable, under our circumstances, whenever the attention of thoughtful persons should be generally drawn towards the doctrine of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, Pusey was raised, as it were, for this very purpose, to hinder their defection, as by other ways, so especially by showing them that all their reasonable yearnings are sufficiently provided for in the English system rightly understood; that it could not be but that, under such circumstances, Pusey would appear to superficial observers as smoothing men's way to Rome, as any one else would who was the most efficient person in a move opposed to Puritanism; but that the more the matter was looked into, the more it would be seen that he was the great check on their going; e.g. the temptation arising from Hampden's being made and acknowledged Bishop would have been more keenly, more extensively felt, had there been no Pusey among us. It is no answer to this to say that a great many of those who go attribute their going to Pusey and his teaching; they must do so for the credit of their logic; it is but another manner of saying that Antiquity led them that way. And some of them, I believe, make it a point of duty to drive him up, if they can, into a corner, expecting that he will be forced to follow them. But whether I am right or wrong in these opinions, it is plainly unjust and cruel to inflict such a disgrace and disability upon him without giving him the chance, so far as it may be done, of clearing himself².’

The Bishop saw that in one respect at least he had made a mistake. He dismissed from his mind—so he wrote to Keble—all reports about Pusey that had come to him privately, and that he could not refer to Pusey for an explanation. But his view of Pusey's work and influence was still what it had been. Pusey was not sufficiently

¹ It is *this* letter of the Bishop of Oxford's which is replied to by Keble in the letter printed in the ‘Life of

Wilberforce,’ ii. 101–103.

² ‘Life of Bishop Wilberforce,’ vol. ii. pp. 101, 102.

alive to our differences with Rome; and his devotional works encouraged Romeward tendencies. But shortly afterwards he met Keble in the railway.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, St. Peter's Day, 1851.

. . . I went tête-à-tête with S. O. on Tuesday from Bishopstoke to London, and in some measure poured myself out to him. I think he was inclined, when I left him, to adopt the course of censuring the 'tones and tendencies' in his forthcoming Charge *generally*, and so far as he *pointed* the censure, to do it in an Appendix, with references, &c., and to waive any *public* stay of your preaching. I shall press him, as I have opportunity, to leave it free also *in private*: but if he should not (of which I am greatly in fear) what will your line be? . . .

The Bishop hereupon announced a further concession. Pusey must still consider himself debarred from officiating in the diocese of Oxford. But the Bishop would not publish his intended letter. He would reserve for his Charge in October what he had to say about the danger of certain lines of Pusey's teaching; and he would put his remarks on Pusey's adapted works into an appendix. Pusey might meanwhile publish his sermon¹, and anything with it that might tend to reassure the Bishop.

But Pusey could not acquiesce in this settlement. The inhibition from officiating was unjust; and he could only acquiesce in it, if at all, for a reason independent of the motives which had dictated it. He would acquiesce, if Keble thought that it would save scandal. But the real question must be settled otherwise. If the Bishop was not prepared to say that Pusey's doctrine and practice were opposed to that of the Church of England, the inhibition ought to be removed. If—Pusey again urged as a matter of simple justice—'tones and tendencies,' pointing in one direction, were to be visited by an inhibition, they surely ought not to be overlooked when they pointed in another.

E. B. P. TO BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

July 2, 1851.

'Germanism is (as the Bishop of London, too, thinks) a far greater

¹ i. e. 'The Rule of Faith as maintained by the Fathers, and the Church of England,' preached before the Uni-

versity of Oxford, on the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany, 1851.

and more imminent peril than Romanism. I have lately had a letter from a clergyman imploring me to furnish a friend of his (once a member of this College) with arguments to meet the Pantheistic sentiments and opinions which he continually meets with in *educated* society in London. I believe myself that — and his school are preparing far more directly for Pantheism than I can be alleged to be for Romanism. The history in Germany is distinct evidence for this. Pantheism sprang out of much sounder divinity than —'s, and in this place whatever ground Germanism has gained has been since those principles which I believe to be those of the Church of England have been discouraged. It is easier, my Lord, to pull down than build up. For myself, I would most thankfully have retired long ago from every office of responsibility, and sought peace, and left the struggle to your Lordship, had I dared. Most thankful should I have been to have been set free from this weary strife, but I dared not. I have seen for twenty-six years that Neologism was the peril which was before the English Church, and that the course which Evangelical theology (like the Pietism of Germany) shall take would have much to do with the issue¹.

Pusey once more begged that the charges against him might be tried in a court of law.

'If,' he wrote to the Bishop, 'your Lordship would be hindered by the expense (having so many other calls upon your income), I would offer to pay your expenses, were you to prosecute me. If I have taught anything contrary to the Church of England, I have no wish to avoid being convicted; but I do deprecate any extra-judicial condemnation².'

The Bishop replied that he was not blind to the threatening evils of Neologian teaching; but that he knew of no person, occupying the same position with regard to himself, who appeared to do so much for Neology as Pusey did for Romanism. If it were necessary to prosecute Pusey, the Bishop would not be deterred by any considerations of expense; but a prosecution would not, in his judgment, be for the good of the Church. A Bishop might express his wish that a presbyter without a cure of souls should not officiate in his diocese without a formal inhibition.

Pusey's last letter to the Bishop was as usual forwarded to Keble.

¹ Life of Bishop Wilberforce, vol. ii. pp. 107, 108.

² Ibid.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

St. Mary Church, July 8, 1851.

. . . On Sunday I got your long letter to S. O. which we are copying (you will not mind that), and I hope to return it to-day. One wonders how he can stand against it. As far as I remember, what I said to him in the train was, in substance, that the less he did, the less mischief, and so far that secret inhibition was better than public : but that I did not know how it might strike you. Now it appears that there is no chance of secrecy. I found people at Hurst, where I was then going, rather full of the subject. And even if he had privately forbidden your preaching and you had acquiesced in it (as you must, except by remonstrance, for there is no legal remedy, I believe), he could not expect that we should not vindicate our principles against any public attack. I shall write to him, perhaps, to this effect, and mention a few more things which have occurred to me : you will let me know more exactly how he has reported our conversation, for you did not enclose his letter to me. I will mention whilst I think of it that he named — and — as persons who especially ascribed their going to what they learned from you. . . .

With the Bishop's letter and Keble's answer before him, Pusey appealed once more, and in more direct and forcible terms than before, to the Bishop's sense of justice.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

35 Grosvenor Square, July 9, 1851.

MY LORD,

. . . [Mr. K.] mentions to me two of the cases which your Lordship mentions to me as having been under my care 'who especially ascribed their going to what they learned from me,' — and —. Now, my Lord, this illustrates what I said, that I could explain the cases, if your Lordship would but tell me of them.

After explaining the two cases that the Bishop had mentioned, he goes on :—

In this way I am sure that I could show your Lordship how very exaggerated your Lordship's impressions about me are.

I understand your Lordship's proposition now to be, that I should remain without officiating in the parochial churches in your Lordship's diocese, in compliance with your Lordship's *wish*. But I suppose, my Lord, that you do not mean by a 'wish' an expression which I am at liberty *not* to comply with. So then it would only be an 'inhibition' under a gentler name.

What Mr. Keble wished to express to your Lordship was, 'that the less your Lordship did, the less mischief would ensue : and, so far, that

secret inhibition was better than public.' But he adds, 'now it appears that there is no chance of secrecy.'

My Lord, I do not think your Lordship in the least knows whom this would disturb. I suppose that your Lordship would have appeals from some of your clergy whom you much value. I heard that your Lordship drew a distinction between Mr. Keble and myself. Your Lordship now finds that we are one. The part of the *Paradisus* which is most full of doctrine (that on the Holy Eucharist) was translated by a friend of Mr. Keble's, and I consulted Mr. K. upon the points of doctrine in it. In like way your Lordship will find, I think, that Mr. Marriott or Mr. Butler could not officiate except under protest that they agreed with me.

Your Lordship speaks of this prohibition as simply a request to a clergyman without cure of souls not to officiate in your Lordship's diocese. But a Canon of a Cathedral church in a Cathedral city is not an ordinary case of a clergyman without cure of souls. Your Lordship chooses mild words, and puts the case as involving as little as possible, in order to soften to yourself the severity of the act. But I think, my Lord, that if you would consider the case of any other Canon in any other Cathedral city, your Lordship would see that no slight slur was cast upon him if he were suspended out of the precincts of his Cathedral. And in my case there is the further anomaly that, as Professor, I am to preach next term in the very church in which your Lordship would forbid my preaching in the afternoon, in order to protect from my influence the very young men to whom I shall, by virtue of my office, have preached in the morning.

I see no satisfactory way open except that I should be admitted formally to clear myself, or not be condemned and punished without form of law. I am willing to be punished if I have offended against the rule of the Church. If not, I cannot but think that the punishment is arbitrary and unexampled.

If your Lordship adopt this course of punishing me without a hearing, and refusing the opportunity of explanation, the only course which I see before me (in behalf of those who, equally with myself, may suffer by these unofficial suspensions, or who may be distressed by them) would be publicly to call upon your Lordship to sustain in a court of law, if your Lordship can, any grounds for this virtual suspension. I shall be disposed to make it the most formal appeal I could to your Lordship not to punish me in an arbitrary way, but to give me an opportunity of vindicating my character as a faithful minister of the Church of England.

He enclosed in the letter a note stating that he had long ago determined not to reprint *Avrillon*.

Meanwhile many influences were being brought to bear on the Bishop. Mr. Gladstone, with the generous energy

which is his characteristic, 'tried what he could do' to induce the Bishop to withdraw the inhibition, but in vain. Mr. Justice Coleridge, at Keble's instigation, represented to the Bishop, in strong language, the danger of proclaiming by his inhibition that Pusey's teaching was incompatible with membership in the Church of England.

'I think,' wrote Keble to Pusey on July 10, 'the Bishop is a good deal staggered: and a few more such letters as J. T. C. is likely to write to him will very likely cause him to give up his inhibition altogether.'

That the Bishop was 'staggered' is plain from his next letter to Pusey. In order to maintain the consistency of his attitude, he refers to Pusey's answer to Mr. Dodsworth, his sermon on the 'Rule of Faith,' and his private explanations, as so far 'improving' his position, that the Bishop, 'taking into account the large liberty allowed on the other side,' did not 'feel that it would be just to require Pusey's silence on pain of inhibition.' But since the Bishop was not satisfied with the effects of Pusey's ministry, and especially with the adapted books, he could not but tell Pusey that it was his wish that Pusey should not officiate in the diocese until he had disavowed the passages to which the Bishop excepted. The Bishop continues ¹:—

There are some passages in your last letter which I read with great regret, and though they do not make me alter the decision at which I had arrived, yet I think it right to point them out to you.

(1) You use language concerning declarations which you expect from some clergy in my diocese as to their not officiating except under protest of their agreeing with you, which is far too like a threat.

(2) Further, you state that I am meditating 'punishing you without hearing you': and you intimate that, in the event of my acting, you shall call publicly upon me, by the most formal appeal, to sustain my decision in a court of law instead of punishing you in an arbitrary way. Now as to the first of these statements I must say that I deny that I have not heard you. I have invited any written communication

¹ This is printed from the letter that the Bishop sent. It will be noticed that it is arranged differently from the draft of the letter as printed in the 'Life of Bp. Wilberforce,' ii. 112; and the following words at the end were not

sent to Pusey: 'And since you have recourse to such a threat, I can only say that until it is withdrawn I distinctly and formally prohibit your performing any ministerial act in my Diocese under pain of formal inhibition.'

you may wish to send me : I am ready to receive more : and as to the second, I have already stated to you that I do not think that the highly responsible power now possessed by a Bishop of preventing in his diocese ministrations which he deems injurious to the Church by one without cure of souls in it, ought to be limited to cases of heresy and false doctrine, which would warrant the infliction of punishment by the Courts. To this view I adhere, and upon it I shall act.

I am, my dear Dr. Pusey,

Very sincerely yours,

S. OXON.

Pusey, in reply, disclaimed any wish to make a threat, and again defended himself on the same grounds as before. He ended with a special appeal to be allowed to preach because of the practical needs of the young men at the University.

The questions between the Bishop and Pusey had, under the stress of discussion, been at last narrowed down to the one point of the adapted books. Mr. Gladstone then suggested that Pusey should express regret to the Bishop on the score of the adapted books, or withdraw them from circulation. Pusey replied :—

Christ Church, Feast of St. James, 1851.

. . . I quite feel that any Bishop has a right to forbid any clergyman from officiating in his diocese, if he think it undesirable, on grounds which Ecclesiastical Courts would not bear out. But then, if the wish or prohibition be public, he is, surely, bound in justice to see that no further imputation be cast upon him than is meant. If the Bishop were finally to express the wish that I should not preach, he ought to say publicly what he says privately, that he does not think that I exceed the bounds allowed by the English Church. This would be a great gain. . . .

I cannot conceive that the Bishop would be in the least satisfied by my expressing my regret, if, in any cases, persons had been led away from the Church of England, on occasion of my books, unless I withdrew the books themselves, although the books are not all of the same cast, and on his own statement, it might be the effect of books out of print. I could not, however, say even this, without implying my belief that he was misinformed. For I cannot be party to a scandal against myself which I believe to be unfounded.

I do not want any answer to all this : I only wished to tell you my own feelings. . . . God bless you.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

Keble was equally against the withdrawal of the books, though he did not defend every expression.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

St. Mary Church, July 29, 1851.

I see no chance of what W. E. G. proposes coming to anything. For it amounts simply to this: you are to say, '*If* the books have done harm, as on the Bishop's statement on his own knowledge I am bound to suppose they have, I am sorry for it.' With this, the Bishop would not be satisfied: in fact, it would amount to nothing, and if he did accept it, it would be from a kind of feeling that it meant a great deal more, which he would think himself at liberty to express in his statements and comments.

You must on no account withdraw those two books¹. I do not say that you might not perhaps make a few omissions in reprinting the *Paradisus*, not as though the passages were unjustifiable, but on the ground of their being misunderstood, and startling good people. If you asked my leave to do it, I should grant it you. But you know far better than I what effects such a thing might have in different directions. . . .

Keble followed this up by a letter to Mr. Gladstone himself: who, in replying, after explaining the relation in which he stood to the Bishop and Dr. Pusey, stated his belief that the Bishop's 'marvellously acute and rapid mind' had not yet matured; and he earnestly deprecated a crisis 'which would precipitate in fixed forms his cruder ideas and check the free growth of those which, but for that crisis, may be destined to correct and overrule them.' He quite felt with Keble that 'the Bishop's interest and influence for good were mainly at stake': and that 'Dr. Pusey's influence would be increased, but increased in a sense (despite of himself) from which mischief and danger are inseparable.'

Mr. Philip Pusey went still further than Mr. Gladstone in the direction of urging concession to the Bishop's wishes. He even drew up a form of retractation, which he advised his brother to sign. Pusey thanked him for his 'kind pains and love,' but added:—

'My own impression as to the draft is that I should be virtually condemning myself for what the Bishop is persuaded of but which I believe not to be true. To publish books which should tend to lead

¹ Dr. Pusey has written against this sentence—'*Paradisus*' and '*Spiritual Combat*.'

people away from the Church of England and persist in so doing, after people (whom I thought to be wrong) spoke against it, would of course be a grave fault. I do not believe the Bishop's instances to be correct. He will not tell me what they are. I have told him that I do not doubt, if sifted, they would prove to be mistaken.

'The retraction which you have suggested would be interpreted far too vaguely, and be used to condemn what I believe to be true. I am sure that there must not be anything vague with the Bishop of Oxford. Besides, such a statement would unsettle hundreds of minds who use the books and would not know what to believe, what not.

'I do not retract anything which I have published.'

Pusey, from the early days of this controversy, had asked again and again for an interview with the Bishop. He had even talked of 'forcing' one. If he could only see the Bishop, the latter could not 'keep him courteously at arm's length.' An opportunity presented itself on the occasion of a confirmation at St. Peter's-in-the-East, Oxford, in August.

'I don't know,' wrote Keble on Aug. 6, 'that I should rejoice in the thought of your meeting [the Bishop] were I thinking only of your cause as the cause to be pleaded, for I think S. O. more dangerous *vivâ voce* than on paper, for several reasons. Still we cannot be sorry that he should so far do what is right.'

In spite of Keble's fears the meeting was satisfactory. The Bishop was evidently beginning to feel why Pusey's enforced silence was a serious matter. The result of the interview was that the Bishop proposed, and Pusey agreed to the proposal, that matters should remain as they were until after the delivery of the Bishop's Charge in the autumn. Pusey thought that he had 'mitigated' some of the Bishop's impressions for the time; though he doubted whether the effect would last.

From this date the relations between the Bishop and Pusey were greatly changed for the better. Nothing further was said or done, until the delivery of the Bishop's Charge in November, 1851. In Bishop Wilberforce's Charge of 1851 may still be read the impression which this long controversy had produced upon its author's mind. Undoubtedly the Bishop pronounces unfavourably on some salient features of Pusey's work; but he does this without mentioning any name, and if he does use expressions

which could only have one reference, they are kindly and respectful. The appendix, however, supplies quotations from the adapted books of passages to which the Bishop took exception.

In conclusion, he was so far from publishing his inhibition that he contented himself with expressing an earnest hope that Pusey would no longer circulate the adapted books, and that by an open disavowal of Roman errors 'would remove the suspicions which must otherwise attach to his ministry¹.'

Pusey felt that the appendix to the Bishop's Charge obliged him again publicly to defend himself, although he had gone over the same ground in his Letter to the Bishop of London. He therefore set himself to the task. In April, 1852, however, he found that, owing to the pressure of other work, little progress had been made with the proposed reply. As he had become hopeless of getting the necessary leisure for this larger work, he contented himself with sending to the Bishop a sketch of the 'line of explanation' which he intended to make. This sketch will be found in the appendix at the end of this chapter². After dealing in detail with the passages that the Bishop had quoted, he concludes:—

'And now, my dear Lord, after making this explanation, I would ask whether I may not be left free as to the office of preaching within your Lordship's diocese. I have publicly said that I did not and would not preach against the expressed wish of a Bishop.'

The letter was probably sent to Cuddesdon on Friday, April 23; the Bishop's reply is dated May 6. 'I suppose,' wrote Pusey to Keble, 'that the Bishop is either taking time to consider or consulting.' At last the reply came. In view of Pusey's recent University sermons, his private assurances to the Bishop of the nature and strength of his anti-Roman convictions and efforts, and the large liberty allowed to our clergy in an opposite direction, the Bishop did not feel that he could do otherwise than set Pusey free as he requested.

¹ Charge, Append. p. 25.

² See p. 336.

Pusey sent the correspondence to Keble, who replied as follows :—

Hursley, May 10, 1852.

‘I hope I have not inconvenienced you by keeping these papers so long. On the whole I am thankful for them, and think that they indicate a certain progress in the Episcopal mind. And it seems to me that it may be very desirable, if it can be done consistently with *the* object which makes you anxious to preach, that you should quite defer acting on his permission (unless on any marked call to preach, which might possibly occur) until after the Long Vacation : I mean that it seems fairer to him in some respects, and more likely to conciliate him, and would be more satisfactory, I think, to one’s own feelings, to try the effect of the book first. You see, though he is on the whole disappointed, he does really in this letter give up several of his former objections—and whatever strong Lutheran bias he may have about those points which he still objects to, I cannot but think that when he sees how very anti-Roman your treatment of them is (an aspect which on every account I conclude you will make as clear as possible), he will feel that while continuing his protest against your view, it will be out of the question for him to renew his inhibition. The sermons which in the meantime you will have published will, I doubt not, help towards this good effect.’

At length this painful question was closed; the Bishop had virtually withdrawn the main charges against Pusey, which Mr. Dodsworth’s Letter had suggested. He no longer maintained that Pusey’s teaching was ‘directly condemned by the judgment of the English Church’; but he still distrusted Pusey’s judgment in such matters as the practice of Confession and the recommendation of the adapted books, while he also wished that Pusey would make some such kind of declaration against Rome as would have been natural to himself. It was not probable that the Bishop and Pusey would at present agree on these matters; but they were felt not to be sufficient grounds for an inhibition. Pusey wrote, but did not publish, what he had to say by way of reply to the Bishop’s Charge; mainly, it is probable, from an unwillingness to prolong controversy with one who on personal as well as official grounds had so many titles to his respect. Some few years elapsed before the subject of preaching was again mentioned between them; it then took the happier form of an invitation from the Bishop to Pusey to take part in the Lent sermons at St. Mary’s, Oxford.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XII.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD¹.

MY LORD,

[May 25, 1851.]

I have now read with deep pain the Letter which your Lordship has written against me; but, antecedently to saying anything about doctrine, I must request your Lordship's reconsideration of some statements, relating to subjects which I cannot explain in public. For I cannot, in public, make statements relating to, or involving, individuals.

Your Lordship contradicts what I have stated as to my practice with regard to receiving confessions, 'because,' you say, 'they are so directly at variance with what I have heard in private from those who, as I am certain they would not misrepresent you, so it is almost impossible that they should be misinformed.'

Now surely, my Lord, before such a direct but vague contradiction is made,—a contradiction which your Lordship means only as an imputation against my memory, but which will be made a charge against my truthfulness,—your Lordship should tell me, in confidence, if you think right, but anyhow tell me, to what you allude. My memory may fail me, in this whirl of pressing duties amid which I live, day after day: but in my controversy with Mr. Maskell I went over, in memory, every circumstance which I could recall, and I stated what I believed to be the truth.

Your Lordship makes in the same page three implied statements. For by many, if your Lordship's letter were printed, as it stands, they would be construed as statements, and would be believed by many whom my answer would never reach.

I will take the second and third first.

2. 'You have directly counselled young women of not above eighteen, to go to confess against the known wish of their parents.'

I do not know of any such case.

2. [? 3.] 'You have, *in many cases*, where no desire for it was expressed or felt by the persons themselves, urged confession, and its repetition and continuance on those who have sought your guidance.'

¹ Cf. p. 314 above.

I know of no one such case. The only two or three instances in which I recollect to have recommended confession individually, I alluded to in my P.S. to Mr. Richards, p. 272. They were not persons who sought my guidance. One was a personal friend. The two others were strangers, one of whom, year by year, was evidently weighed down by a hidden grief, and through it had no power of mind. I am not sure whether there *was* a third case, in which I judged that confession was the best remedy. I recollect one case in which I have 'urged its repetition or continuance.' It was many years ago. I dare not explain it, but your Lordship would be satisfied. My conviction is, that confession has uniformly been continued (when continued) at the earnest desire of the party confessing.

Your Lordship's first statement is, 'You have encouraged young women, living at home, under the charge of their mothers, to confess secretly, and purposely unknown to their mothers.'

I suppose that your Lordship does not lay any stress upon the word 'mother,' although you twice repeat it: I will suppose that you mean in their parents' house. And since in No. 2, you limit the age to eighteen, I conclude that your Lordship means, grown up, but unmarried ladies, living in their parents' house.

I have already stated in my Letter to Mr. Richards (Postscript, p. 286) on what principles I have acted in allowing concealment, in any case which I knew of. But I will say that these are all past cases, except three, who are persons of mature age, and which, if your Lordship knew the circumstances, could not disapprove of.

But it is very often a difficult case. The individual feels the need of confession: he or she (for there is no difference of duty as to the fifth commandment) is one of the persons whom the Church contemplates in the exhortation before Holy Communion; yet to make known that they used confession might create unhappiness, or painful discussion, or even affect the health of a parent. I believe that, in all but extreme cases, it is best to make it known to the parent, and of later years I have recommended it. If I have allowed the contrary, it has been in order to save pain to the parents, that I have not pressed adult sons or daughters to make it known.

None of these cases, as far as I recollect, have been in your Lordship's diocese. I may say that I gave great offence to a clergyman, who was involved in controversy on this subject, because I would not maintain that grown-up daughters were free, in all cases, to disregard the wishes of their parents. In two cases, I advised a child to give up confession for a time. But I have said, without scruple, that the Church appeals to people's own consciences; that, in the nature of things, no other can be a judge whether a person need confession (for no other can tell what disquiets the conscience); that Holy Communion is necessary to salvation for those of age to receive it; and that our Church says 'it is *requisite* that no person should come to the Holy Communion but with a quiet conscience,' and recommends this way to

quiet the conscience to those who cannot quiet it otherwise. I do not, then, think that any one old enough to judge for himself or herself does, according to the mind of the English Church, require leave from a parent to do that which the Church judges in certain cases (of which theirs may be one) to be requisite.

I have now stated fully and unreservedly my own practice, a practice not relating to your Lordship's diocese, and so, if I may so speak, not falling under your Lordship's cognizance. But I wished to be unreserved.

But now I may respectfully claim of your Lordship to tell me, as I said (privately, if your Lordship thinks right) what the cases are to which your Lordship alludes. For your Lordship, too, will think that an individual has no right to make charges secretly against another, nor has your Lordship any right, nor can I conceive that you could have any wish, to publish to the world any such questions as you have printed, in the first instance, for my use. Your Lordship is well aware that such statements are the most invidious and the most hateful to the English mind which could be put forth.

In the Letter to the Bishop of London, I wrote the more briefly on confession, because I had already written twice recently upon it. But I may say, that when I spoke of being 'for the most part simply passive' in the matter, I was thinking chiefly of what Mr. D. stated, about my 'encouraging everywhere, if not enjoining, auricular confession.' Yet I did mention my University sermons, although they were not the cause of confessions, for the first was eight years subsequent to my first receiving them. I did not inculcate habitual confession in them, although I certainly said, and do think, that much deadly sin which corrupts and desolates whole lives, might be very much checked, if the young were not so shut up. I did quote the pious Chancellor Gerson, who, speaking from large experience, said that confession was '*directrix efficacissima ad Christum.*' Your Lordship speaks of the undoubted fact that '*many* who have resigned themselves entirely to my spiritual guidance have passed from it to Rome.' Your Lordship speaks of '*numerous instances, in all ranks, of all habits of mind and all degrees of education.*' You say, 'I do not believe that all, or nearly all, those who from you have passed or are passing to Rome, had any other bias than that which your teaching communicated to them.' May I respectfully ask your Lordship how many you include under these words, how many who have resigned themselves entirely to my spiritual guidance, you suppose to have joined the Church of Rome? Secessions had begun before Mr. Newman left us, nearly six years ago; his influence, and that of others, has been actively employed ever since; hundreds, I fear, of men and women have left us; your Lordship's words may be interpreted as something very large. I have been thinking over those who have left us, having been in any way under my care. My own strong conviction is, that your Lordship's words, as you have written them to me, would give

a wholly untrue idea, (1) as to the numbers who have left us having been in any way under my care, (2) of the degree in which they were so.

I have very much to answer as to the rest which your Lordship has stated, but I should be thankful to know whether your Lordship can be satisfied upon these points, because, unless you can, anything further may be useless.

But I would say that I should not now insert the Apostrophe which your Lordship quotes (p. 36). It is now seven years since that book was published; it was never republished: only a fresh title-page printed when Mr. Burns left the English Church: it has been for some time out of print. My attention has never been called to the passage since it was first published. I now recollect that I left it, as being like the Apostrophes in Greek Fathers, considering it as such. In the same volume, I changed the Invocations to the Blessed Virgin. If the book were in print now I should cancel it.

There are other passages both from it and the 'Year of Affections' which your Lordship has understood in a different sense from that in which I did. I mean, especially as to the purity of the Blessed Virgin before the overshadowing by the Holy Ghost (which I did not mean to teach). Your Lordship also quotes one statement, without the note which I expressly meant to guard it from the deduction which your Lordship makes. Another your Lordship quotes without the context which explains it, and the sense which it thus has is quite different from the true. Your Lordship also, in another place, makes inferences which I do not acknowledge.

But I will not enter into this now, because I wish first to ask your Lordship whether you will give me a hearing as to the cases about which you make the general statements. I do not ask your Lordship to tell me who your informant or informants were; although they ought not to be ashamed to let me know what they have stated to your Lordship about me. But I would content myself with asking your Lordship to tell me the name of the persons alluded to, under your three questions in pp. 12, 13, in your Lordship's contradiction of my statement in p. 12: and as to those who 'resigned themselves wholly to my spiritual guidance,' I believe that I could satisfy your Lordship, if you would place the facts before me: I cannot answer generalities, for I do not know what to answer. Let me give your Lordship an instance as to the Leeds secessions, which you allege, and which you may well suppose, cut deeply into me. Your Lordship instances them as persons whom I selected as the best teachers of others. You do not know the ground of the selection. Mr. Ward I selected, being at that time an entire stranger to me, but being placed in an important place in the diocese of Ripon, having been a curate of Dr. Hook's and being still his friend, and in good report as a very laborious parish priest. He was firm when Mr. Newman went. When the Bishop of Brechin left St. Saviour's upon his election to that Bishopric, I had offered the

vicarage to Mr. Milman, whom your Lordship has since been glad to place at Lambourne. I doubted, partly on account of his then thickness of delivery, which was represented to me as making his sermons unintelligible. I had applied to him on account of his fervent tract on Confirmation. Mr. Minster was then twice pressed upon me, by one who was a good Churchman, and as likely to heal the breach because he was a friend of Dr. Hook's. He was already an incumbent in the Bishop of R[ipon's] diocese.

Your Lordship will hardly continue to impute to me, as wrong, these nominations. But I instance them that your Lordship may the rather think that if the circumstances as to other cases about which you have been informed were explained to you, you might think differently about them. Your Lordship's statement may be turned against yourself, or the Bishop of London, in any case in which one appointed by you leaves the English Church.

I will mention another passage which gave me pain. It is one in which you express pain as to my answer to Mr. Dodsworth. But one expression is, I believe, inaccurate.

'That you should thus have dealt with Mr. D.'s charges is the more painful to me, because when you offered to meet publicly that attack as a mode of satisfying me' [rather, 'I informed you that I was going to answer that attack in consequence of the Bp. of L.'s Charge'—I mention this only because it would make my printed statement inaccurate] 'I earnestly entreated you to deal with the *whole subject-matter* in the broadest manner, and not *in any way which could savour of special pleading*.'

I have looked over your Lordship's letters this morning, and there was no such implied imputation that your Lordship thought it necessary to warn me against special pleading. *On one point* your Lordship asked me to speak plainly, whether I was acting as an English priest or a Roman confessor, and your Lordship said on this words which pained me. 'It would be difficult to bring home to one who wished to evade the charge that his ministry,' &c. Your Lordship did not say this directly to myself; and, conscious that I did not deserve it at your hands, I was pained at such a mode of writing.

My Lord, it is not my fault if I have not been explicit to your Lordship. I have again and again sought oral explanations and your Lordship declined them. And yet they are the most open and the fullest and most easily made definite. But your Lordship did not, I believe, make this warning.

I am sorry that your Lordship is not satisfied with my explanation. People on different sides have expressed themselves satisfied with it. But certainly I do think it hard that your Lordship should charge me as you do.

Before I go further I would beg your Lordship to tell me what you desire of me in order to satisfy you. When Dr. Hampden was accused to your Lordship, your Lordship put to him certain questions con-

taining popular statements of truth, which to some did not seem to touch upon the precise errors imputed to him, and which he was surprised to receive, as containing such simple elementary truths. Yet your Lordship could not have thought more favourably of the *tendency* of the Bampton Lectures on the one side than of my writings on the other.

Some of the subjects mentioned in your Lordship's letter would necessarily involve long discussion in order to hear them fully. Thus I believe the old translation of Dan. iv. 27 is right, 'Redeem thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy upon the poor,' and that the words 'shall cover a multitude of sins' in St. James, means the sins of the person himself. Your Lordship has put in italics, p. 33, as wrong, what I believe to be the very words of Holy Scripture, 'Redeem thy sins.' But it would require great length to expand this—and the book from which your Lordship cites (the 'Guide to Lent') is out of print, nor did I intend to reprint it.

I will observe that I believe another word to which your Lordship objects to be also a word of Holy Scripture, and that in Cant. v. 1 the word is rightly rendered by the Latin *inebriamini*, as by the LXX. Your Lordship's letter found me endeavouring to prepare for publication a sermon which I preached before the University 'On the source and rule of Faith,' in vindication of the principles of the English Church. In it I speak of Purgatory, Indulgences, the Denial of the Cup, the cultus of the B. V. I wished to write notes upon it, amid all the pressure of time and other duties. But yesterday I was engaged for twelve hours; to-day I have been writing for ten. And this is my day of rest (Sunday). If I am to attempt to answer your Lordship's letter, I must of course give up this. Perhaps as the matter has now hung on for six months, your Lordship may think it as well that it should wait a little longer, when the Long Vacation will allow me to give full time to the subject. But I will do whatever your Lordship wishes. I would specially request your Lordship to tell me whether you charge me with tendencies or with doctrine which seems to you to contradict the Articles of the Church of England. If the doctrine should unhappily, after all my explanations, appear to your Lordship definitely to contradict the Church of England, I would respectfully submit that the only way satisfactorily to settle the question would be to try it in an Ecclesiastical Court. No one would be satisfied by my being simply forbidden to officiate in your Lordship's diocese. Those who think that I teach soundly would think me hardly dealt with; those who wish to see me cast out would think the measure too lenient. If, on the other hand, your Lordship condemns the *tendency* of my teaching, I would beg your Lordship to consider the principles upon which you would hereafter have in consistency to act. I should think that your Lordship would find in the writings of Mr. Stanley, of University, tendencies (to say the least) which would lower the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. I know that some of the Heads of

Houses condemned one of his sermons very strongly on this ground. He, like myself, belongs to a College; he also has preached at St. Mary's, but without censure: he has been forming a school, known as the Germanizing school. I do not wish to judge Mr. Stanley, but in common reputation he is quite as much the leader of a Rationalizing school, and I believe is so entitled, with more justice than I, of a Romanizing. Again, the present Bampton lecturer, Mr. Wilson, of St. John's, has been preaching such doctrine as has much scandalized many of the Heads of Houses. Your Lordship will allow me to say that you will be asked why they are allowed to officiate, I forbidden.

Your Lordship will excuse any want of connexion in this letter. There were a great many subjects which I thought it right just to touch upon, and I am so tired that I can hardly write.

Your Lordship's humble servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church, May 25, 1851.

Monday morning.

I can still hardly write from fatigue. But I wished to explain to your Lordship—

(1) That I conceived myself quite free, through your Lordship's own sanction, to preach at St. Mary's. If I intermitted preaching it was because I was overworked, and at St. Mary's Mr. Eden did not ask me. But Mr. Crawley's statement to me, at the time of the consecration of Littlemore chancel, was that your Lordship did not object to my preaching, but, on account of my adapted books, did not wish me to preach on that occasion which might have seemed to connect me specially with yourself. I mean that your Lordship, as I was given to understand, objected *then* to my preaching on that occasion only. I think your Lordship's words, p. 1, would be understood otherwise ('republish your adaptations' should be 'so long as you do not withdraw your adaptations'), for I believe that it was mentioned to your Lordship at the time that I had not published any lately, nor had I any present intention of publishing any more. I have not republished any since 1848. I only mention this as fact.

But what I wished chiefly to say is, that I do not mean this letter as an answer to your Lordship except as to the questions as to those who have used confession with me. I am most desirous to give to your Lordship any information, any definite statements which you may wish, as to my belief upon any subject. I can hardly enter upon the subjects without writing very fully. I see that I have not fully answered even the one question which I began. I see that your Lordship states 'You [I] represent it as so essential to their safety as to lead them to account it as a means of grace, the habitual use of which would be perilous to discontinue.'

My Lord, surely a person may leave off a practice on wrong grounds. A person may be tempted to leave off confession because he finds it a check upon his falling back into deadly sin. The shame of having

to confess it is a secondary and very imperfect ground. But still I suppose that in the case that a person, contrary to his own conscience, gave up or was tempted to give up all that which he himself believed to be good to his soul, because he felt it to be a check against sin, or because he desponded about the Church, your Lordship would not think it a valid ground. Yet *if* I have recommended a person to continue confession, who thought of abandoning it, it must have been on some such ground.

Your Lordship also uses the expression, 'The Church of England gives no authority to her ministers to treat it as the common diet of the soul under the ordinary circumstances of the spiritual life.' I have not done so even with my own children. But if a person wishes to confess from time to time the Church of England gives me no authority to refuse or to discourage it. 'Still less to *press* it with all the force of spiritual authority upon the young and shrinking, as almost essential to their safety,' p. 11. These words would be interpreted as describing what I did. If anybody have given you that impression, they have given you one utterly false. But might I, with respect, say to your Lordship that what I say of confession I say upon the experience of thirteen years. Your Lordship will pardon my saying that whatever your Lordship may know of abuses, if wrongly used, you cannot know the comfort and blessedness when rightly used, because nothing but experience can make one feel the blessedness of things spiritual.

I have not been able to enter into the largest part of your Lordship's letter, but perhaps your Lordship might desire a very brief outline in explanation. If your Lordship means that faith is not only as our Article says, the means whereby *we receive* the Body and Blood of Christ, but that the Presence in the Holy Eucharist is the result of our faith, not of the words of consecration, I should certainly most widely differ from your Lordship, receiving the words 'accedit Verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum,' and holding with many of our own most esteemed divines, that the Presence is by virtue of our Lord's consecrating words. I trust that your Lordship, too, holds this. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice would depend upon the doctrine of an objective Presence, although not material or carnal, but sacramental and spiritual.

I take in its literal sense, as I believe, the Article against Transubstantiation, believing the Bread and Wine to remain in their natural substances. I do not understand the Roman doctrine. If the 'ens' of which your Lordship speaks were physical, our Article would reject it. If it is metaphysical, I do not understand it. I do not accept it, but, as I have uniformly said, with good Bp. Andrewes, I leave it a mystery.

Your Lordship acknowledges adoration of Christ present—I mean no more. I never used the words as given by Mr. D[odsworth], but cancelled a page in order to preclude the possibility of it. I have said nothing which I thought could possibly bear upon purgatory or works

of supererogation. I do not receive either. I do not receive, nor did I mean to teach, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. I do suppose that it is part of true repentance to make what amends a person can, to mortify himself wherein he has sinned, to do acts contrary to his former sins; but I attach no other value than your Lordship would to any good works, which He Who works them in us accepts and crowns when wrought, having first accepted us in His Son. 'Deus in nobis dona coronat sua' is a maxim of St. Augustine which has seemed to me to express the double truth, 'God worketh them,' but '*in* us.'

I do not use nor have meant to encourage Invocations. Your Lordship has quoted a strong passage of mine.

Your Lordship has mistaken my meaning about Rosaries, p. 38. It simply never occurred to me that a Rosary of Devotions to the Holy Trinity could be mistaken for the ordinary Rosary of Devotions to the Blessed Virgin. It was an ambiguous term, but clear in the context. But it is near post-time—and I am too tired to write as I wish.

Your Lordship thinks that persons under my care leave our Church more than others. Mr. D[odsworth] said of one who had been under his care and had come to me, 'Dr. P. will keep her out of the [Roman] Church.' She is the mother of a family. Others I know, who were hesitating, would not come to me, dreading my influence to detain them.

E. B. P. TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD¹.

MY DEAR LORD,

[April 18², 1852.]

I had hoped, long ere now, to have sent your Lordship the letter which I began when I received your Lordship's Charge. But I wished not simply to write a letter of explanation which might be done in a few pages, but to enter fully into the subjects upon which your Lordship commented. This I have been unable to do; and amid increasing pressure of other duties, fear that I shall not be able to do before the Long Vacation.

It occurred to me then that it might be satisfactory to your Lordship, that I should state to your Lordship the line of explanation upon the subjects in regard to which your Lordship commented on my adapted books.

1. The Holy Eucharist.

My line of explanation is, to say that the literal meaning of Holy Scripture implies alike a real Sacramental presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the words 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood of the New Testament,' and that the Bread and Wine remain in their natural substances, in the words 'this fruit of the vine,' 'the bread which we break,' &c.

¹ Cf. p. 326 above.

² It seems probable that this letter was not sent before April 23. After

it was begun, it was sent to Hursley, and altered, by Keble's advice.

I go on to say, that it is granted by some of the Schoolmen themselves, that there is less difficulty in believing that the Body and Blood of our Lord are present under accidents whose substance remains, than under accidents whose substance is gone. This I do to avoid the charge of Consubstantiation, and for the sake of some who are apt to speak slightly of any but Roman statements.

I have then gone on at some length to show from the Fathers of the six first centuries, that they hold both the actual real Sacramental Presence of our Lord's Blessed Body and Blood 'under the forms of bread and wine' (of which the Homilies speak), and also that 'the bread and wine remain in their natural substances.'

I am going on to say that the passages in which the Fathers speak of change, transformation, &c., do not mean a physical change but a Sacramental Presence.

This I hope to continue this week, but it occupies a long time, because not only the words of Holy Scripture itself, but every passage in every Father, almost, is disputed ground. One has to make one's way by inches.

Having gone very fully into this, I thought of not going, with the same fullness, into the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, because it depends upon this. If there were no real Sacramental Presence of our Lord's Blessed Body and Blood, there would be nothing to offer and plead before Almighty God, except the outward symbols of an absent Thing. Since Holy Scripture (as taken most literally, and that meaning confirmed by the Fathers) speaks of a real, actual, Sacramental Presence, then we offer to God on 'the Altar' which Holy Scripture speaks of as belonging to Christians only (Heb.) the 'pure offering' of which the prophet Malachi speaks, not the bare bread and wine only, but that which is sacramentally and really, not in any carnal way, the Body and Blood of Christ.

I meant to say very briefly on the subject of the Adoration, that since our Lord is truly present we adore Him, as truly present. The words 'adorable Sacrament,' I took in the sense of venerable, not of adoration of the outward elements.

2. The value of good works in reference to past sins.

I have preached twice on this subject before the University, and hope, please God, to publish my sermons. In them I tried to explain that it was part of the condescension of God to give to our works which He enables us to do and worketh in us, as members of Christ, a value which of themselves they could not have; that He sanctifies them by imparting to them a value derived from the Cross, and speaks of them in terms belonging to Christ in order to bring us the closer to Christ. I meant to show that the words 'atone for' 'redeemed' are used by Holy Scripture of the works of penitents as made acceptable through the atoning Blood of Christ out of especial condescension and encouragement to us.

I have said already at some length in a note on Tertullian (Oxf. trans.)

that the use of the word 'satisfaction' in the Ancient Church was quite distinct from its modern use. They spoke of sorrow, deeds of love, &c., under the name of 'satisfaction' as part of repentance, which repentance, being accepted through the Blood of Christ, was essential to their everlasting salvation. The meritorious cause are the Sufferings of our Lord alone: repentance and works of repentance (if there is time for them, and there is always time for true contrition and sorrow poured out to God) are essential to the application of those merits to us.

The modern system current in the Church of Rome looks upon 'satisfaction' as the discharge of a debt, due as the *temporal* punishment of sin, after the remission of the eternal. The Ancient Church (which our own, as I understand them, follows in the Homilies) looks upon them as instruments appointed by God, for the remission of eternal punishment through the Blood of Christ, as being a part of true repentance.

I may here venture to say to your Lordship that I do not think that you weighed the bearing which your observations on Dan. iv. 27 would have on the fullness of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

Surely, my Lord, the meaning of God the Holy Ghost in the words which He puts into the mouths of Prophets goes far beyond the specific occasions upon which they were spoken. The whole Ancient Church has understood those words 'Redeem thy sins by righteousness' as setting forth an eternal truth, that subsequent works of repentance had a value imparted to them through the virtue of the Redemption to procure from the mercy of God in Christ the blotting out of repented sin.

I was writing last summer, at some length, on the modern doctrine of satisfaction, as relating to temporal punishment due to sin, and shewing that the modern doctrine of Purgatory and of Indulgences are founded upon *this*. I thought of embodying that, perhaps, in this Letter. The ancient belief was that satisfaction or making amends, penitential sorrow, deeds of love, &c., were a part of true repentance; the modern theory makes them over and above a payment of a *definite* debt due to Almighty God, for forgiven sin, which (as they say) is to be discharged here or in Purgatory.

I believe that the subjects which your Lordship has blended, p. 23, are entirely distinct; that the language you quote, p. 22, is quite borne out by the Ancient Church, and is quite unconnected with the doctrines of Purgatory, Indulgences, 'the celestial treasures of merit,' or the modern doctrine of satisfaction.

This I hope to make clear.

3. The Blessed Virgin.

I do not think that I have retained any expression which speaks of any other purity than that conferred by the overshadowing of God the Holy Ghost. I think [I shall be able] to shew that the high language of Antiquity all bears upon her being an instrument employed by God

for the mystery of the Incarnation, and that the mistake has been in later times to employ this language of a sort of mediatorial office with our Lord.

4. The word 'Inebriation.'

I must say, my Lord, that I believe this to be the language of Holy Scripture; and, as such, that we may not shrink from it. The extent of its use is a question of expediency. It is used in every school of the Ancient Church—and by the coldest writers (as Eusebius or Theodoret) because they believed it to be in Holy Scripture.

Angels and Saints.

Your Lordship says—'to take upon this head but one passage.' I believe that your Lordship has lighted upon the one passage which occurs in my adaptation. I recollect debating upon it, and leaving it, regarding it as an apostrophe like those of the Ancient Church. Bishop Ken's words to his guardian Angel are stronger. The work, however, from which your Lordship quotes, has long been out of print, nor did I mean to reprint it. Your Lordship speaks of 'Angels and Saints.' I believe that there is only the one apostrophe which your Lordship quotes. I left out the whole section of the Paradise bearing upon this subject.

Rosary.

I should not have retained the word had I known then that it was originally connected with the cultus of the B. V. I might write something on this as well as on the modernness of the prayer in the Ave Maria, which I thought might be useful to people. But as I used it, it is not connected with any Roman doctrine or practice. These are the subjects upon which your Lordship has commented. I should not, of course, write in a controversial tone: i. e. where I cannot but think (if I may say so respectfully) that your Lordship is mistaken, I should state what I believe to be the truth in itself, not in contradiction to your Lordship. And my object will be to vindicate what I believe to be the teaching of the Church, on the one side as well as the other, i. e. to set forth the teaching of Antiquity as based upon Holy Scripture, in contradistinction, where it is so, with anything taught in the Church of Rome.

When I saw your Lordship in last summer, I explained, as far as time allowed, any case which your Lordship could tell me of, of those who had been in connexion with myself and who have subsequently joined the Church of Rome. I said that if your Lordship could in confidence state to me any names which had been mentioned to your Lordship I could with equal confidence explain to your Lordship that they did not receive any impulse from me towards the Church of Rome, but that I uniformly retarded them. People have come to me as their last chance. My friend Mr. Keble likened me to a physician who took desperate cases, which others declined. Of course such an one has more cases of failure. People have come to me in different stages. I have tranquillized many

who had been shaken, some by Mr. Newman, some by Mr. Dodsworth, some by Archdeacon Manning, and they are now at peace, faithful members of our Church. In some cases, I failed at once. In some, I succeeded for a time. I should be most thankful to be spared the toil. It has been one of the greatest wearinesses I have, to go through the Roman question again and again, until I turn almost sick at the very first words in a letter which tell me of perplexities about the Church, knowing what a weary labour there is before me, what great fears of its fruitlessness, how much it will hinder what I wish to do of solid work for the Church in exposition of Holy Scripture. I wish, my dear Lord, I could send these cases to you, and that you could satisfy them. But if for the Church's sake and for their souls I undertake a very weary and often thankless labour, which often brings on me ingratitude and misrepresentation, it is really hard that this is made a ground of suspecting me, that I fail where no one can succeed.

I do not think that a single case can be produced of a person *bona fide* under my teaching, without a previous strong disposition Rome-wards, who has left us for Rome. I know of none. The Roman Catholics are very angry with me for what they call my skill in detaining people in the Church of England, and people in the Church of England blame me for leading people out of the Church of England to Rome.

I have ventured to write again on this subject, because I am sorry to find from a letter of your Lordship to Mr. Justice Coleridge, that your Lordship still retained the old impression, which I thought that I had in my interview with your Lordship greatly shaken.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE EXETER SYNOD—PLACE OF LAITY IN SYNODS—
REVIVAL OF CONVOCATION—BOOK ON THE 'COUNCILS
OF THE CHURCH.'

1852.

THE action of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Gorham case had drawn men's attention with considerable urgency to the question of the relation of Church and State. The objections to that tribunal were exaggerated by some into a theory that the civil power could rightly have no control whatever over any part of the action of the Church, and that the Roman Catholic position was alone consistent with loyalty to the rights of our Divine Master. But Pusey had set himself to prove, in his fragmentary work on the Royal Supremacy, that the facts of Church history would not support such a theory; on the contrary there was a legitimate area for State action in relation to spiritual affairs, although at all times it was important that there should be some effectual means of expressing the voice of the Church. In case the limits of State interference were transgressed, it was necessary also that the machinery for protest should be at once available.

But here a question of grave import at once arose. What kind of assembly was necessary adequately to express the voice of the Church? In other words, what sort of constitution was necessary to a Synod in order to make it really effective? Some influential laymen—
influenced, unconsciously perhaps, by considerations which obtain in political life—and a small band of sympathizing clergy, held that no Synod exclusively made up of clergy had the right to speak on behalf of the Church, and that it was therefore necessary to include a lay element.

The theory of lay representation in Synods had been encouraged by the action of the Church Unions immediately after the decision of the Privy Council in the Gorham case. The importance of those meetings seemed to a large extent due to the prominence and numbers of the laity who attended them: and this fact influenced the discussion of the various projects for combined Church action which were almost immediately put forward. On all sides men were asking for the revival of Convocation,—the legal representative gathering of the clergy; while those who were connected with the several Church Unions were anxious to fuse their forces into a single powerful body, whose action might command the attention of those in power. The immediate need of the moment seemed to be the union of as many persons and influences as possible, with a view to vindicating the doctrine of the Church; and it was perhaps natural that for the moment the principles involved in the constitution of such union should fall into the background, and especially the share which could be assigned to the laity in the formal and public action of the Church.

Pusey and Keble fully recognized the importance of combined action; their immediate concern, it will be noticed, was not with any Diocesan Synod, nor with the revival of the Synodical action of Convocation, but with a proposed representation of all the Church Unions in the country at a central Church Council in London.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Aug. 14 [1850].

Are you afraid of the workings of the representative system? I gave into Palmer's plan so far, because a desperate condition requires, or at least allows, desperate remedies. This *vis inertiae* is so great, that it requires a strong effort to overcome it. I suppose (do not you?) that there are scarcely three of our Bishops who would not acquiesce in the present state of things, not feeling what they involve, unless they were pressed from without. But in order to make that pressure effectual, it must be consolidated. . . .

The Bishops, no doubt, will try to obtain for us a better Court of Appeal. Even this they will (I do not mean it disrespectfully) compromise, if they think that the compromise will satisfy the body of the Church.

I was inclined then to any lawful measures to set this stone rolling. We may be hopeful that it will not roll too fast. I am not without anxiety that it might roll in rather an oblique direction, and so should have let it rest, had I dared. But do we dare? We have the pressure of this decision upon us: can we dare not do all we can to put it off?

Keble was in favour of the 'representative system,' although in the then state of the law there was room for doubting its strict legality. But Pusey had expressed in a postscript a fear lest an effort should be made to bring a lay element into Convocation.

Keble asked in reply:—

'Do you not think — and — right in wishing for some constitutional influence for the laity in a non-established Church? Only it should not be in Convocation, but in election of Bishops.'

The question was pressing on Pusey from various quarters. The Bishop of Exeter had already summoned a Diocesan Synod to meet on June 25th; but he was perplexed by some constitutional question that had been raised.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER TO E. B. P.

MY DEAR SIR,

Heligan, June 3, 1851.

I am much obliged to you for transmitting to me Mr. K.'s valuable communication. On that subject I will trouble you soon again.

But I now much wish to obtain your sentiments on a very different subject. What might be honestly and safely said—with as much of LIBERALITY as can be exercised under those qualifications—respecting the rights and position of a sound and orthodox laity in a well-ordered branch of Christ's Church?

A very right-minded layman of considerable station and influence urges me to take an opportunity of saying something on this matter publicly, which may allay the widely-spread, however unreasonable, jealousy of our own laity, very few of whom can be deemed sound or orthodox.

What was their right in the Primitive Church, in respect to Canons, especially of government, as well as doctrine?

Oblige me by addressing your answer to me at *Exeter*, so that it may reach that place before the 10th.

Yours, my dear Sir, very faithfully,

H. EXETER.

Mr. Henry Hoare, whose name is so honourably associated with the revival of Convocation, appears to

have thought that Diocesan Synods should consist partly of laymen, and that a Bishop's hands would be greatly strengthened by the adoption of some measure of the kind. He appears to have consulted Pusey on the subject.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Undated.]

Mr. Hoare mentioned his subject to me. I said that, of course, a Bishop might consult whom he liked, and act by their advice, if he pleased; that it would often be wise in him to get at the minds of his people, and still more to carry them with him, by this sort of consultation. Our public meetings, imperfect as they are, are meant to be something of this sort. So is the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G. But this would be a very different question from formal representation and enacting what should be binding on the conscience. A Bishop would be wise who should not order anything throughout his diocese without ascertaining the mind of the laity. The Surplice war in the dioceses of London and Exeter was owing to a strange want of foresight. This would be a wise concession on the part of a Bishop. It is, in a measure, like St. Cyprian saying, 'I have determined ever since the beginning of my Episcopate, to do nothing without your judgment had,' i.e. nothing of a practical nature, for at the same time all principles of discipline or matters of doctrine were ruled without them. But he could not make anything binding on the conscience.

I looked into some books on Diocesan Synods for the Bishop of Exeter, but did not find much. I should think it very advisable to get at the minds of the laity. But I do not know that there would be any authority by which the majority should bind the minority, or the representatives of the majority of parishes have any claim to rule the minority, or the Bishop himself be governed by them (the shepherd by the sheep), but it would be very well for him *informally* to ascertain their minds, as his own ground for acting or suspending his action.

Excuse haste. I have been detained this morning by the Roman question.

But the question arose in the most pressing form north of the Tweed. Pusey heard from the Bishop of Brechin that Mr. Gladstone was about to write a pamphlet advocating some scheme for the admission of laymen to Convocation.

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Pusey, Jan. 19 [1852].

. . . I have heard from one who was very much saddened by a report that you were going to advocate the lay element in Convocation. He was very much pained at the prospect of having to write against you. When writing the 'Ancient Precedents' I went with

great care into that German element, of the mixed assemblies as it existed in France, Spain, and among our own Saxon forefathers. I was satisfied that the relation was the same which in good time was continued by Convocation and Parliament, i. e. that the laity accepted but that the original decision was with the clergy.

I look with perfect dismay at the prospect of lay legislation in matters of faith. It is a new element; one stamped by no precedent, no experience except by a body¹ which has laid aside the Athanasian Creed, and that for a few years only.

The Exeter Synod itself shows the exceeding carefulness necessary in a doctrinal statement. For even theirs was grammatically unsound. It would have been a grave matter had it been Convocation, not a Diocesan Synod.

It is invidious to write to you as a layman against the lay element. But I feel that we can only look for a blessing and safety in ways of God's appointment; and that we should be incurring exceeding risk in trying in the present state of things an untried plan. I have always looked hopefully, but then I should look no more with hope to end my days in the Church of England. (I do not mean that I look to Rome.)

The laity ought to have a voice in the nomination of the Bishops, which is now political in the hands of the Prime Minister. They ought clearly to have a negative voice. But it is an ill compensation to give them direct authority in matters of faith, which they never had, because they have not the indirect influence [over appointments] which they ought to have. . . . God bless you.

Yours affectionately,
E. B. PUSEY.

Mr. Gladstone replied that he had addressed a letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen, with his concurrence, in favour of the introduction of the lay element into the Scottish Synod, without any reference to Convocation. But he would also desire to see it in Convocation, subject to the proper limitations for maintaining the supreme power of government and teaching in the episcopate; e. g. in Scotland—

1. That the Bishops should be the original donors of the power.

2. That the Bishops exclusively should have the initiative—at least in all matters of doctrine or discipline.

3. That the distinction should be kept broadly in view between the essential and inalienable powers of the Episcopal College, and the administrative provisions, so to

¹ i. e. the American Church.

speak, by which laymen, and even presbyters, share in the supreme acts of the Church.

Pusey and Mr. Gladstone had a long interview on Sunday, Jan. 25th: but without much agreement, excepting on the point that, if laymen were admitted to Synods, questions of doctrine should be reserved for the Episcopate. On this subject Mr. Gladstone had expressed himself with great force and clearness.

‘As the governing power over the Church resides most properly and strictly in the Bishops, and as they are supremely responsible in particular for the decision of doctrine, I cannot but express the strongest conviction, that the initiative of all legislation should rest with them absolutely and exclusively; and that it should be competent to either of the other chambers to approach them spontaneously in the way of petition only. Their *veto* would, of course, remain complete; and between these two powers duly carried through the whole scheme, I hope adequate provision would have been made for preventing any collision between such a constitution and the great and immovable principles of our ecclesiastical polity¹.’

Pusey was no believer in the permanence of any arrangements for admitting laymen to Synods and debarring them from voting on questions of doctrine and discipline.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Undated, but 1852.]

... In truth I think that let people guard, how they may, both doctrine and discipline, it can only be for a time. The power of the laity is a growing power. To admit them into Synods, and then exclude them from what is to both parties of most real interest, will, I am persuaded, never hold. If Parliament could disown the functions of legislating for the Church, and invest the lay members of the Church with authority to give a civil sanction to the decisions of the ecclesiastical body, this would be something tangible. Anything else would, I am sure, be only preparing for encroachments. I look with terror on any admission of laity into *Synods*. It at once invests them with an ecclesiastical office, which will develop itself sooner or later, I believe, to the destruction of the Faith.

The Scottish bishops, however, met, and accepted the

¹ ‘A Letter to the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus, on the Functions of Laymen in the Church.’ By the Right

Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. for the University of Oxford. Murray, 1852; pp. 35, 36.

principle to which Pusey was so strongly opposed. The Bishop of Brechin was almost in despair.

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Private.

April 23, 1852.

I hear that the Scotch Bishops have decided by a majority of 4 to 2, that the infusion of the lay element into Synods is 'both permissible and Scriptural.' This, unless something can be done, will end the Episcopate of the Bishop of Brechin, and I should think discharge out of the Church many whom the Gorham Judgment left. It is blow upon blow, blow upon blow. No sooner has one recovered one, but one is stunned by another. The Bishop of Brechin says rightly, this changes the basis on which we stand; we no longer stand on the basis before the Reformation; 'we break the whole connexion with the current of history.'

I do not know whether anything can be done. Although there is authority for the laity accepting and so ratifying what has been done, there has been no authority, that I know of, for their rejecting or amending anything, except as to matters of discipline. I think that even of these, the only instance of reference with admission of changes which I could find was that which I mentioned, 'Royal Supremacy,' p. 127¹.

I understood from you, that you did not contemplate that the laity would be called in to decide in matters of doctrine. And yet if, without all reserve, they are admitted into Synods, there is nothing to hinder them. And doctrine is quite as likely to be brought in as any other question. In fact, it is inevitable that it would. But this would alter the whole theory of the Church. The Church meets, not to settle what the faith shall be, but to declare what it always has been. The Bishops primarily, and presbyters as delegated by them, declare this. There cannot be two faiths. Either those who declare it, or those who reject it, are heretics. If the Bishops are not heretical, the laity ought to receive their statement of faith. If they are, the appeal ought to lie to some large body. If the Scotch Bishops decided (*μη γένοιτο*) heretically, the whole Anglican Episcopate, all which are in communion, might be appealed to. But it does not belong to the laity to reverse it, or to reject it.

I write in haste, thinking that you might define your own views more clearly than I think they were in your pamphlet; and I trust that you will look to precedent. For the nineteenth century is too late to experimentalize on the constitution of the Church.

God be with you.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

Pusey was anxious to ascertain exactly how far, in

¹ Cases in which decrees of Councils, submitted to the Civil power for revision, to Charlemagne; pp. 127, 128. in matters of discipline, have been

Mr. Gladstone's judgment, the influence of the laity was to affect doctrinal questions. The laity, Mr. Gladstone had said, were not to have a *joint decision* in matters of faith. They were not to *frame* any decision in such matters. But they might *consent* or *not consent* to doctrinal propositions framed by the Bishops. Did this mean that, without their consent, such propositions should not be received by the Church?

'Supposing,' writes Pusey to Mr. Gladstone on April 26, 'e.g. that the Convocation, in consequence of the Gorham decision, were to lay down, in plain words, that "all infants duly baptized with water in the Name of the Holy Trinity are regenerate," or "become children of God, members of Christ, &c." is your theory that the assent of the laity of the Church should be formally obtained, before it should become formally one of our Articles? There is no precedent for this, down to the Reformation. Such a Synod is not of Divine institution, and so, I suppose, we could not look for the Presence of God the Holy Ghost in it. Synods of Bishops are Apostolic. If such a plan were adopted, I believe "actum esset de Ecclesia Anglicana." I do not write this, that you may answer it to me. But as you have been the occasion, I suppose, of the decision of the Scotch Synod, I wished you to clear up your own view on this point to others.'

Pusey's eagerness in the matter was quickened by the anxiety of Bishop Forbes. His Episcopate, so Pusey wrote to Mr. Gladstone, hung upon the course which this matter might take. 'If,' the Bishop had written to Pusey, 'this becomes the law of the Church, I cannot become a Superintendent¹; we break our whole connexion with the current of history.' Pusey added:—

'For myself, I have always said, "So long as the Church of England makes no organic change, all is well." How long it would remain without an organic change if this were adopted, God knows. If the laity were to reject such a declaration as to Baptism, it would be an avowed indifference as to doctrine, and the Church of England would then be in a new position. The words of Elijah or Hezekiah, longing to be gathered to his fathers before these evils come, rise often to the mind amid these fresh-gathering storms.'

Pusey wrote to Dr. Skinner, the Primus of Scotland, to remonstrate with him on the resolution in favour of lay-membership of Synods. The Bishop deprecated Pusey's

¹ The name of the superior officer substituted for the Bishop by the Lutherans and by the early Scotch Reformers.

anxiety. He pleaded the example of the American Church; and observed that the English Convocations themselves were based on a principle inconsistent with the retention of all matters properly of faith in the hands of the Episcopate.

E. B. P. TO THE RIGHT REV. DR. SKINNER, LORD BISHOP OF
ABERDEEN AND PRIMUS OF SCOTLAND.

Christ Church, May 15 [1852].

MY DEAR LORD BISHOP,

I thank you much for your letter, but I must say that it confirms my fears. I would rather burn my right hand than sign or have any part in that Resolution. I had not the counter-resolution, nor exactly the wording of that which was carried; but the substance of it was that the admission of laity into Synods was Scriptural and [permissible].

It would be a different proposition to say that it was not contrary to Scripture, although I should think that it is contrary to all the implied teaching of Holy Scripture as to the office of Bishops and Priests. The deposit of the faith, the form of sound words, was committed by the Apostles to the Bishops (Timothy, &c.) with the charge that they should commit it to others also. It is a known fact, that, however laity were admitted to be present at Councils on the faith, they were never (whether Emperors or others) admitted to have a voice as to the decisions on the faith. . . .

I do not mean that a Church which admits laity to decisions of faith has so far abandoned its trust as to be thereby cut off from the Body of Christ. All abandonment of a trust given by God involves evil consequences, but does not, of necessity, involve the extremest evil. If the Church of the United States has admitted the laity to a voice in deciding on matters of faith, I believe that her Bishops have abandoned a trust committed to them, and, sooner or later, they must suffer by it. Probably they are suffering by it already, in that they cannot restore the Athanasian Creed. God only knows how much heresy this may not let in upon them. Some of the heresies on the Incarnation, against which the Athanasian Creed is a protection, do recommend themselves very subtly to the human intellect.

In like way, if the Scotch Bishops admit the laity to decisions as to the faith, I believe most entirely that they will, in a most solemn manner, have betrayed their trust. And I believe no abandonment of a trust can be without evil consequences, sooner or later. . . .

I do most entirely think that 'the Constitution' of the American Church is based neither on warrant of Holy Scripture, nor of the Church, down to itself. I believe that it introduced a new principle. And you too will feel that it is very alarming to introduce a new principle in such matters. . . . The United States Church has happily denied no truth. It has, in suppressing the Athanasian Creed,

abolishing the form of private absolution, suppressed a good deal. Not having formally denied anything, it is not heretical, but it has run great risk of forfeiting its deposit by suppressing it. . . .

Your Lordship says, 'If the basis on which we have established our principle be, that it is not inconsistent with the Primitive constitution of the Church.' But, my dear Lord, on what principle can you maintain that it is not inconsistent therewith when the whole practice of the Church is against you? Surely when you have Synods in every century, and after a time, in every Church, and have not any instances of laity joining in a decision on faith, what proof can you have for anything, not contained in the most express words of Holy Scripture, if this is not proof? What proof is there, that Priests only, not laity, can consecrate the Holy Eucharist? I fear that the principle might be more extensively fatal than the practice.

But then, my dear Lord, there is not only the negative evidence of the absence of the laity from the Synods, but the positive declarations of those most in authority, the Emperors, that *they*, as being *laymen*, had no voice in matters of faith. The Bishops, on their side, say the same. They say it, too, as matters of principle. You will recollect Constantine's words to the Bishops, 'God made you Priests, and ye have been given as judges to us.' I wish you could look again at the § 1 in my book on the Royal Supremacy (I would gladly send it you), pp. 17-22, 26. I cannot imagine, in the face of these public disclaimers on the part of the highest laity, and of the claims on the part of the Bishops, what plea can be urged for the admission of the laity into Synods, as not being contrary to the constitution of the Primitive Church.

Now, my dear Lord, you encourage me to write plainly. Are you prepared to establish for the Church in which God has allowed you to have so eventful a position, that the whole question may, I suppose, turn upon you (or any other of the four who voted for it), a new principle of deciding upon matters of faith, unsanctioned by Holy Scripture (I do not say 'contrary to,' although I believe it to be 'contrary to its spirit') and without any authority from Antiquity? The utmost you could say was, that it was not forbidden. To this I have said that it is as much or as little forbidden as any of the offices of the Priesthood are. And as to Antiquity, what more energetic denial can there be than the uniform practice of 1,700 years? We find (1) it is stated as a principle in early times that laymen are not to interfere in matters of faith, (2) that practically they were uniformly excluded.

Now, may I implore you by His mercies Who has entrusted to you, in a way in which He has not to us, the well-being of the Church over which you are a Bishop, and a great influence over ours, to look, not to the way in which this decision may be made least unsafe, but what plea in its behalf *can* be adduced from Scripture, or, I do not say Antiquity, but from the Church anywhere, at any time, except the

Church which omitted the Athanasian Creed, brackets the Nicene and the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' and omits the form of Absolution? If there is no plea from these, what are the Scotch Bishops doing?

I do not wish to involve you, my dear Lord, in justifying your measures to me. There is no call for this. But I do most earnestly wish you to set definitely before your eyes what you are doing, that you should do it clearly and with full knowledge, or not do it. I cannot but think that you would not venture to have any part in changing the constitution of the Church from that which it has been since the Apostles, 'full of the Holy Ghost,' left it. May God direct your Lordship.

In Him your very faithful servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce had said that the Church would cease to be Catholic if it accepted lay voting. Keble 'thought it would be a sin, but not a forfeiture.' But he 'wanted to know whether the reason why the laity might have no part in making Canons on any subject (which he granted as a fact) was not *this*:—that the only *sanction* properly canonical is spiritual censure, tending to excommunication, which of course must be kept in spiritual hands.' If this point were saved, he asked 'whether there would be any objections to such indirect interference of lay persons, as was that of the Christian Emperors? Could such interference be helped? And if not, had it not better be organized?'

'What I meant,' replied Pusey, 'about the laity having no part in settling the doctrines or discipline or ritual of the Church, was that they had never had it. It is one thing whether [of itself] the final appeal being in doctrinal matters to the Queen, or the admission of laymen into Synods, would destroy the Catholicity of the Church; another, whether so altering the constitution of the Church would not probably involve consequences, sooner or later, which would do it; i.e. whether, sooner or later, heresy would not be affirmed, on the doctrine refuted. I should anticipate this; and it is on this account I am urgent against both. The deposit of the faith, and the guardianship of discipline and of ritual, was, as you know, my dearest F., delivered by the Apostles to the Bishops, and in their degree to Presbyters. It was not given to laity, because they are sheep, not shepherds, as one Emperor says. The guardianship of these things seems to have been entrusted to the Bishops as much as other parts of the priestly office. They combined the priestly and the prophetic office of teaching, and this was part of the prophetic office. I suppose it to lie in "Feed My sheep," and the texts about the deposit.'

Pusey really wished, as he explained to Keble, to see a body of Church laymen, acting as a substitute for Parliament, by securing civil sanction for the acts of the Church, but adding nothing to the Ecclesiastical. 'Only conceive,' he wrote, 'Convocation passing an article on Baptism, a lay body refusing it, and so its remaining suspended.'

Keble, as always, was on his guard against exaggerations. He had had some intercourse with Dr. Medley, the Bishop of Fredericton :—

'I had some talk with him about laymen in Synods, and found that he did not quite enter into our views. Still I think that *practically* we might agree. I think, though the Apostles would never have allowed laymen to sign Canons, they would not have minded them settling financial points, choosing officers, arranging districts, and the like : and that it is open to any Bishop, and if so, to any group of Bishops, to take them into his counsels to a great extent. With Medley all my arguments were the contrary way.'

On Nov. 5, 1852, Convocation met for the despatch of business after an interval of 135 years. To men who were mixed up with public affairs, and devoted to the cause in the Church, it seemed clear that if laymen could be in some way associated with the labours of Convocation, that body would command much greater attention in Parliament and the country. In the late autumn of 1852, Pusey had a correspondence with Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope on the attitude of the London Church Union towards this question. Mr. Hope, Mr. F. H. Dickenson, and some others had induced the Committee of the London Church Union to assent more or less directly to the principle of lay-representation in Synods. The result was a difference of opinion which threatened the unity of the Union. Mr. Arthur Baker drew up, and Pusey signed, an address to Mr. Beresford Hope, claiming that the Union should be neutral on the question, or that at least no further steps should be taken in it, without formal notice being given to the Society. After some further correspondence this position was accepted ; but Pusey was more than ever impressed with the absence of accurate information among laymen with respect to the constitution of the Christian

Church, and his work on '*The Councils of the Church*'¹ is a serious effort to supply it.

This work was, after all, like that on the Royal Supremacy, an unfinished fragment. It does not of course pretend to be a complete account of the Councils, provincial and general, between the age of the Apostles and that of Theodosius. It is a review of their constitution and action intended to elucidate only one point, namely, 'that matters of doctrine were always exclusively decided or attested by those whom the Apostles left to succeed to such portion of their office as uninspired men could discharge,—the Bishops of the Universal Church.' The form of the work is, however, narrative and historical; and the thesis is suggested to rather than obtruded on the reader.

Pusey had intended to survey the conciliar action of the Church for 1000 years, and especially to determine the place assigned to the laity in the mixed Councils of France, Spain, and England. Of his labours in prosecution of this vast design only some pages of manuscript remain.

The book is very far from being a mere compilation of learned lore without practical aspects. Pusey has not often written pages on the duty of the Church towards the large masses of heathenized population in this country more instructive than those that are to be found in this book. He was deeply convinced that she would only awake to her responsibilities in these respects when her Synods met in Council.

'The Church herself,' he writes, 'ought to debate upon remedies, and should not leave to individual effort the work of the whole. We need missions among the poor of our towns; organized bodies of clergy living among them; licensed preachers in the streets and lanes of our cities; brotherhoods, or guilds, which should replace socialism; or sisterhoods of mercy, for any office of mercy which our Lord wills to be exercised towards His members, or towards those His outcast ones whom love, for love of Him, might bring back to

¹ The full title is, '*The Councils of the Church, from the Council of Jerusalem to the close of the Second General Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381.*' Parker, Oxford, 1857.

Him. We need clergy to penetrate our mines, to migrate with our emigrants, to shift with our shifting population, to grapple with our manufacturing system as the Apostles did with the slave-system of the ancient world, to secure in Christ's Name the Deltas of population, which the everflowing, overspreading stream of our English race is continually casting up.

'Beautiful as is the relation of the Parish Priest to his flock, lovely as are the village homes of our Village Pastors, and gentle as are the influences radiating from those who

"Point to Heaven, and lead the way,"

yet is there now an appalling need of further organization for a harder, more self-denying, self-sacrificing warfare, if, by God's help, we would wrest from the principalities and powers of evil those portions of His kingdom of which, while unregarded by the Church, they have been taking full possession ¹.'

But he could not think that these great objects would warrant or would be advanced by any indifference to the teaching of Antiquity. The 'lay element,' which had already become 'a sort of proper name,' was an equivocal term. But those who used it in very various senses concurred in meaning that the laity should henceforth have some place in the Convocations of the Church which had not yet been assigned to them. It was forgotten that Bishops already represent the laity; they are virtually chosen by the laity; and if Bishops had at times been chosen who did not or could not legislate usefully for the Church, the laity had themselves to thank. The proper concern of the laity was with the temporalities of the Church, or the civil sanction to be granted to her doctrinal decrees, not with Canons of doctrine or discipline. The Apostles had committed the office of teaching to Bishops; and a Bishop's office was not arbitrary; he had only to bear witness to that which he had received.

In the last resort he maintains that the Episcopate has the right, or rather the perilous responsibility, of decision; and this great principle is traced through Pusey's work on the Councils with a patient thoroughness that will always secure for it a high position, in spite of its fragmentary character.

¹ 'The Councils of the Church, &c.,' by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Parker, 1857, pp. 4, 5.

CHAPTER XIV.

ST. SAVIOUR'S, LEEDS—THE SECOND HARVEST OF DIS-
APPOINTMENT—CORRESPONDENCE: BEGINNINGS OF
RITUALISM — PENITENTIARIES — IRVINGISM — PUR-
GATORY.

1850-1852.

SIDE by side with Pusey's anxieties arising from the Gorham decision, the secession of Archdeacon Manning and other friends, and his own unhappy relations with Bishop Wilberforce, there ran a renewal, and in a more aggravated form than before, of the troubles which at that date seemed to be inseparable from St. Saviour's, Leeds. Pusey had so little to do with causing these troubles that it would be unnecessary to record them at any length were it not that his well-known relation to St. Saviour's made him to be regarded as responsible for everything that happened there. Certainly these unfortunate occurrences increased the general suspicion against him, and the widespread alarm with regard to the issues of the Movement.

The Rev. Alexander P. Forbes, who has been previously mentioned as being incumbent of St. Saviour's, had been consecrated Bishop of Brechin on SS. Simon and Jude's day, 1847, and in the following January he resigned the incumbency. After considerable inquiry, Pusey offered the vacant benefice to the Rev. Thomas Minster, who had been Vicar of Farnley Tyas in the diocese of Ripon, and in earlier days a Curate of Dr. Hook at Holy Trinity, Coventry. On his acceptance, Mr. Minster came to Leeds at the close of 1847, and throughout the winter was assisted by the generous and devoted labours of the Rev. J. H. Pollen, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Before, how-

ever, he could be inducted, Mr. Minster begged Pusey to allow him to withdraw from the engagement. He was in very broken health, and was unable to obtain the Bishop of Ripon's licence for any curate whose assistance he could procure.

'I recommended two men' (wrote Mr. Minster to Pusey on Jan. 15, 1848), 'Mr. Case and Mr. Crawley, to the Bishop; but he sees objections to the appointment of either of them. Dr. Hook has kindly mentioned a third, and wrote about him to the Bishop: but there is also an objection lying against his appointment in his Lordship's mind.'

Mr. Minster desired therefore to make way for some one else, Mr. Moberly for instance, whose name had been before Pusey recently. To his flock, notwithstanding their brief period of connexion, Mr. Minster was already strongly attached.

'I never met with a people,' Mr. Minster wrote to Pusey, 'in which there was so much seeming promise. They are devoted to a degree I have never seen elsewhere, and my grief and regret at the thought of leaving them assumes a correspondingly deep character. Nevertheless it is for the good of St. Saviour's that I should resign and that my place be quickly supplied. That it must eventually rise and be a model for the working of other manufacturing towns there cannot be a doubt. The work already done here is great.' The tree has been severely shaken, but it has only become the more deeply rooted. There are signs even now of an abundant harvest in future years if labourers only can be found to gather it in.'

Mr. Minster's letter was of a character to convince Pusey that he was in his proper place, if only his health could improve, and the difficulties about curates could be surmounted. As the spring went on, Mr. Minster's strength rallied; the Bishop licensed as his curates the Rev. George Crawley and the Rev. F. Beckett, who had worked with him in his former parish; and Mr. Minster was instituted as Vicar of St. Saviour's in April, 1848.

Throughout the greater part of 1848, matters went on quietly enough at St. Saviour's: but at the close of the year trouble began to arise. The Bishop held a confirmation at the Parish Church: fifty candidates were brought from St. Saviour's, and the Bishop heard from Dr. Hook

and others that 'a regular system of confession was taught and practised at St. Saviour's¹.' Mr. Minster had not been wanting in the confidence which was due to his Diocesan.

'I wrote to him [the Bishop],' he informs Pusey on November 23, 1848, 'some time since, giving him a full and very particular account of the work going on at St. Saviour's, and the awful depths of sin we had to contend with in very many of the people who came to us, at the same time claiming his sympathy and advice. The letter was a long one, and appealed very forcibly to his feelings. It however signally failed in its intentions. He simply said in answer that he was sorry for the difficulties I had to contend with, passing by altogether the strong picture I drew of the state of morals amongst my people, and concluded his letter by regretting that the *sins* of former incumbents of St. Saviour's should so strongly operate against my usefulness. In truth anything colder than his Lordship's letter could not well be imagined.'

Pusey had been apprehensive that misfortunes were at hand, and had asked Keble, who preached at the Dedication Festival of St. Saviour's in 1848, to send him a report.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage,

Saturday after All Saints, 1848 [Nov. 4].

I wish you to know about Leeds, so far as I can report. There was no time for me to get an answer to my letter to the Bp. of R[ipon], so I went on Monday afternoon and got to St. Saviour's at midnight. I found that the Vicar had been preaching strongly at the Parish Church the day before against Confession, and that all manner of foolish reports were being circulated. Next day came the note which I enclose. I was not so surprised at it, when I came to talk with Mr. Minster, for he told me all about the low view of the Bishop. That I think he said he had detailed to you. I asked as many questions as I could in friendship, and more than I ought to have done in courtesy, and it seemed to me that they had not at all gone beyond what the Prayer-book authorizes, either in teaching or in practice. With this impression, I called on Hook, on the Wednesday, and asked him whether he objected to the *principle* they taught or to their way of carrying it out. He said, 'to their principle, for they taught Confession and Absolution as a "mean of *grace*," whereas he considered that the Prayer-book allows it only as "a mean of *comfort*," and that only in "exceptional cases."' I asked him how he reconciled this with what he himself said to me at Jedburgh about his own practice, in 1844. He said he was of the same mind then as now, that the

¹ 'Letter to the Parishioners of St. the Lord Bishop of Ripon. Rivington, Saviour's, Leeds,' by the Right Rev. 1851, p. 22.

Confession he approved and practised was no more than confession to a Christian friend (quoting St. James v. 16), and that more than that was more than the English Church allowed : that he did not want to attack anybody, but merely to defend himself : that St. Saviour's was as a colony planted within his borders, undoing his work in various ways (of which he gave me instances, which only amounted to other persons misinterpreting what was done) : and that he was going in his own defence to publish the sermon which he had preached, with a set of extracts from English divines (which he said nobody read now), Taylor, Bramhall, and others, to make out his view. I begged him to be as sparing as he could, told him that I and others were so far in the same boat as St. Saviour's, mentioned one or two points which seemed to me to make strongly against his view : and then I went up to see Mrs. Hook, and he walked back with me half through Leeds, and we parted very good friends. He did not specify any evil practices : so that, as far as I see, it resolves itself into an attack on the principle of private Confession and authoritative Absolution. I reported all this to Moberly to-day, and he wonders both at Hook and the Bishop, but says, if they were to attack Catholic doctrine, it is well they should have chosen this point, it is so impregnable, according to the Prayer-book. I was, as you may suppose, delighted with St. Saviour's and with the kind and earnest people there : surely they and their work will be blessed. . . .

Your most affectionate

J. K.

While Keble was writing his report from Hursley the Bishop of Ripon was visiting St. Saviour's. He was in a stern mood and was determined to 'expose and banish' all that he disapproved of ; he took away with him from the parish library a copy of Pusey's adaptation of 'The Paradise of the Christian Soul.' He left the clergy of St. Saviour's in a state of anxiety, which was not relieved by any further communications from the Bishop for a long while afterwards.

'Somehow,' wrote Keble to Pusey on November 30, in his cheerful common-sense way, 'I don't much think that a great deal will come of this Leeds matter, except (which is a sore exception) the scandal about Hook's sermon.'

But with the New Year the Bishop broke silence. He wrote a long letter, which was afterwards published, to Mr. Minster ; he insisted that the Church of England only authorizes private confession either in the case of those who cannot quiet their own consciences before Holy Communion,

or of the dying; and he desired Mr. Minster and his fellow-workers to order their practice accordingly. To this injunction Mr. Minster promised obedience.

Throughout 1849 and the greater part of 1850 there was no disturbance of outward peace; but the Bishop continued to receive from Puritan quarters incessant complaints against the clergy of St. Saviour's, and the latter were aware that he was receiving them. Mutual confidence in such circumstances was difficult, if not impossible; and the moral friction betrayed itself in battles over points which the clergy might well have waived and which the Bishop certainly might have ignored. Thus the Bishop complained of the erection of a tombstone in the churchyard with a prayer for the soul of the deceased inscribed on it. It certainly was not an imperative duty to truth to erect such a tombstone: but there was no doubt about the teaching and practice of the Primitive Church to which the Church of England appeals; and in 1838, in the case of *Breek v. Woolfrey*, the Arches Court had ruled that such an inscription was lawful. Again, the Bishop complained of a large cross 'over the rood-screen'; of the eastward position of the minister in a return-stall, while saying the Morning and Evening Service; of ceremonies employed in the baptismal service; of locking the chancel-gates, and so on. Any of these things might have been refrained from or given up without sacrifice of principle; and none of them could be condemned unless at the dictates of Puritan prejudice. But on both sides matters were drifting into a desperate position. Distrust and suspicion were the order of the day. In June, 1850, the Bishop stated to Mr. Crawley that the proceedings of the clergy of St. Saviour's were of such a character as to destroy all his confidence in them¹; and the clergy of St. Saviour's, feeling themselves outcasts from the heart of their Bishop, yielded to the temptations which such a situation too surely brings. The time was only too well adapted to encourage despondency as to the Church of England. The Gorham decision

¹ 'Letter of the Bishop of Ripon,' p. 29.

had been given a few months before; alarm and distress were everywhere prevalent: the Bishops, as a body, had done nothing to vindicate the Baptismal doctrine of the Church, and some secessions to Rome had already begun. Wiser people than the clergy of St. Saviour's were losing their heads; and at the annual Dedication Festival of St. Saviour's in October, in the midst of all the clamour about the 'Papal Aggression,' the excitement expressed itself in a manner which any English Bishop was bound to condemn. Twelve clergymen who were present on that occasion passed a resolution to the effect that the history of the English Church previous to the Reformation indicates that her submission to the Church Catholic could only be made through the medium of the Papal See¹.

In accordance with the usual annual practice, a course of sermons had been preached at St. Saviour's during the Octave of the Festival. Two of the preachers were involved in trouble because of their sermons: Mr. R. Ward was suspended by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, in whose diocese he had, since his resignation of St. Saviour's, been licensed to officiate; the Rev. J. H. Pollen, Fellow of Merton College, was inhibited not only by the Bishop of Ripon, but also by his own Diocesan, the Bishop of Oxford. Mr. Pollen had applied the word Sacrament in an unqualified manner to other rites than Baptism and the Holy Communion. In doing this he was, of course, using the word in a larger sense than that of the definition in the Church Catechism, as Anglican divines had done before him, following indeed the usage of the Homilies. And the severe notice which the Bishops of Ripon and Oxford took of such an offence is an illustration of the curious pedantry of high-minded prelates, and of the strange unfairness into which it betrayed them.

In the attack upon St. Saviour's, which the ill-judged declaration of the clergy had done much to justify, the inhibition of the two preachers was only a first step. Where Bishops led the way, humbler people might follow. On

¹ 'Letter of the Bishop of Ripon,' p. 29.

Dec. 2, 1850, the Ruridecanal Chapter of Leeds decided to hold a special meeting 'to consider and adopt such measures as appear to be necessary,' with reference to the doctrines and practices at St. Saviour's. This meeting was held on the 9th. Its members were by no means unanimous; but a majority decided to ask the Bishop to institute inquiries. Within four days of the meeting, the Bishop opened a court of inquiry in the vestry of Dr. Hook's Church. The St. Saviour's clergy complained not only of the shortness of the interval, but of having had no notice as to the character of the proceedings. They found that they had to conduct their own case; to meet charges of which no previous notice had been given; to cross-examine witnesses, and to produce rebutting evidence on the spur of the moment and without any legal assistance; while the case against them was managed by three Low Church clergymen, and, practically, also by the Bishop's deputy registrar. Several of the more absurd charges broke down altogether: the proceedings resolved themselves into an investigation of a single case of confession which had occurred more than a year before. It appeared that Mr. Rooke, then a deacon, while preparing a married woman for confirmation, had urged her to go for confession to Rev. H. F. Beckett, his fellow-curate in priests' orders; and that Mr. Beckett had asked her questions about her past life, which in this case his judgment caused him to think necessary. The facts were not denied, however differently they might be regarded by the parties concerned. The Bishop held that this single case proved the existence of a system which 'had no authority from the Church of England, and was opposed to a written injunction of his own,' and he withdrew the licences of both the curates. It must be added that the Low Church clergyman who had brought a charge of a scandalous character against Mr. Beckett, which he had totally failed to substantiate, was allowed to leave the court without a word of rebuke from his Diocesan¹. On the other

¹ See 'Statement of the Clergy of St. Saviour's, Leeds, in reference to the recent proceedings against them,' pp. 10, 11.

hand, although nothing was proved against another of the curates, Mr. Crawley, he was warned by the Bishop that he must not reckon on remaining at St. Saviour's, since he had 'acquiesced' in its doctrine and extravagant ritual observances without any remonstrance. Mr. Crawley was subsequently suspended for an unguarded quotation from St. Cyril of Jerusalem with reference to the Presence in the Sacrament in a sermon preached eight months before, and for saying the prayers with his face to the east. It is difficult, at this distance of time, while reading the published correspondence with respect to these unhappy episodes, to understand why such slight offences should have been so seriously punished.

The health of the Vicar, Mr. Minster, had been broken before his acceptance of the living; and he had since been obliged to obtain leave of non-residence for a year. His absence was particularly unfortunate at a time when a strong and responsible head was needed in the clergy-house at St. Saviour's. It does not appear that any charges had been brought against him. Now, however, that his curates were being one after another dismissed, he was obliged to return to Leeds. A number of his parishioners presented him with an address expressing confidence and sympathy; and he replied to it by insisting that the Bishop's interpretation of the rules of the Prayer-book respecting confession was at variance with the mind of the Church Catholic, and with the true interests of souls¹. He was occasionally assisted by a neighbouring clergyman: but his health was unequal to the strain of mind and body, and he again wrote to Pusey to resign the living. At the same time a body of the parishioners addressed Pusey, asking him to nominate as their Vicar one of the late curates. The reply was as follows:—

E. B. P. TO THE SENDER OF THE ST. SAVIOUR'S PETITION.

MY DEAR SIR,

February 12, 1851.

I was very sorry not at once to be able to reply to your memorial and that of other communicants of St. Saviour's. You

¹ 'Letter of Bishop of Ripon,' App., pp. 42-49.

know, probably, the deep interest which I must myself ever feel in your welfare, both as the instrument, under God, of St. Saviour's being built among you, and from subsequent love for your pastors, and interest in God's work among you.

Mr. Minster had informed me privately some time past that his continued ill-health made him wish to resign a charge which, much as he loved, he was unable to fulfil; and, subsequently, he has requested me to endeavour to find a successor in his stead. Unwilling as I was, I was compelled at last to do this.

I had heard with feelings of deep pain of the persecution to which your clergy had been subjected on the part of some, who, I trust, knew not what they were doing, and now, I fear, the mind of the Bishop has been very deeply prejudiced against them. I love much those whom I know, i.e. all but one; and him I respect.

But I could not think that the way most likely to obtain for you the calm possession of the privileges which you have enjoyed, would be to nominate any of them as Vicar. It may be enough to say that I do not think that this sort of defiance of the Bishop would be most likely to gain our common end, the calm continuance of your past blessings.

You may be assured that I should not concur in nominating any one who would not, to the utmost of the ability which God has given him, continue those blessings to you, and especially, who could not receive in Confession those who desired to 'open their griefs' to him, and would not gladly minister to them.

I had offered the Vicarage, or rather I had requested two, for the love of Christ, to take charge of your souls, before I received your letter, and I am awaiting their answer. I am satisfied from my personal knowledge of one of these, that you would find in him what you wish. The other was named to me by two persons in whom you would have full confidence.

I hope that such an appointment, so far from depriving you of the comfort and ministrations of those whom you love, might rather, if the new Vicar should gain a hearing from the Bishop, be a means of securing them to you.

Be assured of my deep interest in you, and remember me in your prayers, as I remember you all.

You might communicate this letter to those who with you signed the memorial, but it would be better not to say anything publicly about Mr. Minster's resignation, until he himself announces it, or arrangements be finally made.

These are, indeed, times which call out, in no slight degree, the graces of patience and thoughtful waiting upon God. Pray Him, as you do, but pray perseveringly, and He will not fail to help you in His way.

May He ever bless you.

In Him your very faithful and loving friend,

E. B. PUSEY.

In the next month Pusey paid a hurried visit to St. Saviour's 'to see whether anything can be done to mitigate a dreadful crash.' On his arrival, his chances of producing a satisfactory settlement and calming public excitement were somewhat curtailed by a letter from the Bishop, 'earnestly deprecating his undertaking any ministerial duty in the church.'

On Pusey's return from Leeds, he sent Keble a short report:—

Christ Church, March 23, 1851.

'I had a sad visit to St. Saviour's. It has again to be built up from the foundation. The Bishop has cleared everything away: and I fear that two at least will (private) come back as Roman priests with a Roman mission. One can only hope that among the 7,000, mostly poor and beset by temptation, there may be room for both.'

In the event, all the clergy of St. Saviour's, with one noble exception, joined the Church of Rome. No English Churchman can allow that any mistakes of those in authority could ever warrant such a course. Still the treatment which Mr. Minster and his curates received contributed not a little to this result. Under conditions such as these history and reason go for much less than moods and feelings which are assumed to be the workings of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Ward, the former Vicar, and Mr. Crawley, one of the curates, had already been received into the Roman Church, when at the beginning of April, 1851, Newman, now Superior of Oratorians at Birmingham, arrived at Leeds to be present at the reception of the Rev. T. Minster, the Rev. S. Rooke, and two other clergymen, at St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church. Newman preached on the counsel of Gamaliel. The Church of Rome, he argued, was proved to be of God by the apprehensions which it inspired, and by its success in spite of opposition; the Church of England was given over to the State. He begged his hearers to pray for the souls of all those who had anything to do with the erection of St. Saviour's.

Pusey at once went again to Leeds: this time accompanied by Marriott. He found, that although so many of their

clergy had deserted them, the mass of the communicants at St. Saviour's were loyal to the Church of England. Mr. Beckett's licence had been withdrawn : but he had appealed from his Diocesan to the Archbishop of York, and the latter had, on a technical issue, pronounced the withdrawal to be illegal¹. He was therefore still at his post ; and to his patient and resolute courage at this trying time it was largely due that, with very few exceptions, the congregation of poor people was prevented from yielding to the inducements which were held out to them to follow their late teachers. It was arranged between Pusey and Mr. Beckett that the former should preach on Palm Sunday, with reference to the recent secessions and the duty of loyalty to the Church of England. But the whole circumstances were too much for his feeble health ; just before the time for the sermon arrived, he fainted away, and had to be carried out of Church, his place in the pulpit being taken by Charles Marriott. Pusey remained in Leeds for some days, doing what he could to strengthen Mr. Beckett's hands.

'I am well again,' he wrote to his son, who was now an undergraduate at Christ Church, 'and amid much sorrow have had much comfort. It has been a new scene to me. Boys, mechanics, and mill-girls, using confession ; kneeling thankfully for the Blessing, and bound to the Church by a stronger bond than that which bound them to their late pastors.'

Although the late clergy of St. Saviour's had for the time entrenched themselves in the parish, and were doing what they could to make converts, Pusey had the satisfaction of leaving Leeds with the conviction that the worst was over, and that the work which was so near his heart would yet survive the ruin which had appeared to threaten it. He now had on his hands the difficult task of appointing a new Vicar. Mr. Beckett's appointment was out of the question, on account of his relations with the Bishop of the diocese. The Rev. C. Gutch, now incumbent of St. Cyprian's, St. Mary-le-bone, undertook the duty for

¹ Upon a second appeal of the Bishop of Ripon to the Archbishop of York, the earlier decision of the

Archbishop was reversed. 'Bishop of Ripon's Letter, &c.,' Postscript, p. 19.

three months, but declined to take charge of the living, which had already been offered to the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. Towards the close of the year 1851, at Pusey's earnest and repeated request, the Rev. J. W. Knott, Fellow of Brasenose College, and one of the masters at Shoreham, generously devoted himself to a work, the inherent difficulties of which had been enhanced by the errors of his predecessors, and, it is contended, had not been lessened by the attitude of Church authority in the diocese.

Pusey heard from Mr. Beresford Hope that the Bishop of Ripon was going to attack him on the score of St. Saviour's. The Bishop's 'attack' appeared in the form of 'A Letter to the Parishioners of St. Saviour's, Leeds,' to which reference has already been made. It was in the main a reply to the 'Statement of the Clergy of St. Saviour's, Leeds,' in reference to the Bishop's proceedings in April, 1851. In the text of his pamphlet the Bishop makes no reference to Pusey's action, nor does he directly connect him with the secessions; but he reviews the circumstances of the foundation of St. Saviour's. He had very soon discovered, he wrote, 'that it was the object of the founder to try an experiment; to force a system of his own imagining, copied to a certain extent from mediæval practice, upon the Church at Leeds¹.' The Bishop claims to have warned the founder that the attempt would hinder the progress of the Church in the West Riding. In the appendix, however, the general terms of the letter itself are exchanged for allusions to Pusey by name; and the Bishop complains that before the consecration, Pusey had earnestly insisted on several 'objectionable matters' in the decoration of the church and its arrangements, and that the church had not been consecrated until the Bishop had been satisfied on these points.

A melancholy correspondence between Pusey and the Bishop continued to the end of the year. It was almost entirely a review of the earlier communications with each other which preceded the consecration of St. Saviour's.

¹ 'Letter, &c.' p. 6.

The Bishop explained the gradual alteration of his tone and language, by the gradual emergence of new facts pointing in one direction; and he maintained that the position which Pusey 'really occupied as a patron of St. Saviour's was something beyond that occupied by patrons in general.' He moreover contended that new experiments had been tried, in the 'system' of St. Saviour's, apparently by the introduction of a 'celibate college of priests,' and that it was only by strenuous resistance on his part that he had not been forced into permitting departures from the ordinary Anglican methods in matters of decoration, ceremonial, and even practice. On the other hand, Pusey contended that, as patron, he was simply responsible as ordinary patrons were, no more and no less: he refused to allow that he had wished to force the Bishop's hand, while, as was admitted by the Bishop himself, he had conceded every point to which objection had been raised. The fact was that the correspondence was really irrelevant to the main point at issue between the writers. The Bishop was not unnaturally influenced by the general alarm at the many defections to Rome which had occurred amongst the adherents of the Oxford Movement. He was, in particular, alarmed for Leeds and for his diocese by what he considered the un-Anglican practices of St. Saviour's. There was as yet no such counterbalancing experience as was afterwards exhibited in Pusey's own life, of long sustained Tractarian loyalty to Anglican principles; as years passed, both the Bishop of Ripon and the Bishop of Oxford learnt to believe in that loyalty. At the present moment Rome they thought was the natural goal of the advanced Tractarian, whether at Oxford, London, or Leeds.

Yet it may be again questioned whether the Bishop's method and action, to say nothing of the belligerent attitude of Dr. Hook, did not help to produce those very disasters which seemed to justify his severities. Whatever mistakes were made by the clergy of St. Saviour's (and they were many), there can be no reasonable doubt that both Dr. Hook and the Bishop were endeavouring, under the terror

of the Roman phantom, unduly to limit the frontier of the Church of England. Pusey, although patron, was of course unable to do much in the matter; but so far as the exercise of influence was concerned, he could no more act as the Bishop or Hook would have desired than he could desert the Church of England. In truth he sympathized with neither party. He felt on the one side that no shortsighted alarms ought to lead to the surrender of any, even the least portion, of the Catholic principles of the English Church. And on the other hand he felt that a generation which had but lately become aware of the real strength of their own Church was entitled to special patience and sympathy, so as to reassure and retain their confidence, shaken and perplexed by recent events. Years after, Dr. Hook had learnt to appreciate better the position of one whom he had come to call 'that saint whom England persecuted'; and it may be believed that if Dr. Longley had exhibited towards St. Saviour's that same discriminating judgment which characterized his gracious sway as Archbishop of Canterbury, much bitterness might have been avoided, important controversies settled far earlier, and the Church of England might have been spared serious loss.

Pusey's correspondence at this time was as large and exacting as ever. Allusion only can be made to the published communications with Lord Shaftesbury and with Lord Romilly. Lord Shaftesbury had charged him, as one of the Tractarians, with tenderness towards infidelity; and, as one of the Oxford Professors, with failing to answer the 'Nemesis of Faith' and other such publications. 'I have not heard,' he wrote, 'that any learned and leisurely Professor has as yet discharged his public duty and exposed their abominations.' Lord Romilly, on the other hand, had publicly stigmatized 'the peculiar set of persons commonly called Puseyites' as 'more dangerous than open and avowed Roman Catholics.'

But people were writing to him on other subjects of more permanent interest, which it may be convenient here

to collect without regarding strict chronological sequence. Ritual, for instance, in the technical sense of our own day, was then comparatively unknown: the efforts to introduce it at times encountered fierce opposition. This had been the case at Plymouth, a few years before the period which we have reached. Pusey's advice on the subject was marked, as always, by a consideration for others and a true moderation for which the world at large would have given him scanty credit.

E. B. P. TO REV. G. R. PRYNNE.

35 Grosvenor Square, 2nd Monday in Adv. [? 1849.]

I was very sorry to see the worry to which you have been exposed. I hope it is now come to an end. These scenes do stir up so many bad passions, and so set people against the truth. Certainly, one should be glad that greater reverence could be restored: but I have long felt that we must first win the hearts of the people, and then the fruits of reverence will show themselves. To begin with outward things seems like gathering flowers, and putting them in the earth to grow. If we win their hearts, all the rest would follow. I have never had the responsibility of a parish, but while I could not but feel sympathy with those who held themselves bound by every Rubric, I could not but think myself that since the Church of England had virtually let them go into disuse, we were bound to use wisdom in restoring them, so as not, in restoring them, to risk losing what is of far more moment, the hearts of the people. We have high authority for avoiding even words which may give offence: and for myself, I avoid using technical language, and try to teach truth in as acceptable a form as I can. People shut their ears and their hearts against the truth in one form, which they will receive patiently in another. It is quite amazing how much truth even the prejudiced will receive, so long as they do not meet with the terms which they have been accustomed to object to. And so they get leavened they know not how; and their old narrow belief falls off like the serpent's old skin, when it outgrows it.

I am very glad to see that you acted on the advice of the old men to Rehoboam. One could not but see, amid all that prejudice against P——ism, that there was a good deal of real attachment to the Church. And, after all, the dislike of innovation is a good principle: for there ought not to be innovations in matters of religion. At Devonport, too, where they have been so long neglected, they require the more patience. Were I at Devonport, I would not edge in any outward changes, as though I were waiting for further opportunities, but go on earnestly, preaching, visiting, teaching, be forward in every work of mercy, enlist people's sympathies for the poor, show them that we have large common ground, and that the characteristics of this formidable ——ism are deeper love for God, and of man for His sake.

I think it is of great moment that we should not foster the impression that this great battle is about things external. They think themselves forthwith more spiritual than their teachers, whereas the very thing which we wish to teach them is deeper reverence and awe of God, deeper sense of their own responsibility, deeper knowledge of God's gifts in the Gospel, more frequent communion with Him, conformity to Him, &c.

When they have learnt this in some degree, there will be no more battles about surplices. There will be a deeper strife, but it will be with the world.

You will not mind my thus speaking, but it is a common cause, both in that my own name is so blended with yours, and, much more, for the sake of the very cause itself.

God be with you always.

In those days, bowing to the altar was looked upon with quaint misgiving, in spite of the old traditions and the special directions to that effect contained in the Canons of 1640. Replying to an esteemed correspondent on this subject, Pusey states what his own practice had been:—

E. B. P. TO REV. E. T. RICHARDS.

Pusey, Oct. 1, [1849].

... I bowed to the altar at Devonport. You know all the Canons do at Christ Church. Archbishop Laud recommends it, I think. I have understood that it used to be quite common in village congregations; only when the forgetful times came on in the last century, it was changed into a bow to the clergyman, and now probably discontinued altogether. Where people do not bow, I do not. I think it a matter in which I had best conform to the practice. Indeed, I do not bow, except at Christ Church; but, bowing there, I could see no objection to the Sisters bowing in their little oratory.

Another question which occupied Pusey at this period, although not making a first claim upon the energies of his mind, was the movement in favour of establishing more Penitentiaries. This movement owed more to his own teaching respecting post-baptismal sin than to any other direct cause, except perhaps the influence and practical efforts of Archdeacon Manning and Mr. (afterwards Bishop) Armstrong. Mrs. Pusey had joined the Rev. W. K. Hamilton in setting on foot a rudimentary institution at Oxford for the reception and recovery of fallen women. Archdeacon Manning had sent in proof to Pusey the Preface to his re-edition of a sermon entitled 'Penitents and Saints.'

E. B. P. TO ARCHDEACON MANNING.

[Undated, but end of Nov. 1848.]

I have just read with deep interest your touching Preface. I should be glad of a few more sentences, or perhaps one, in pp. 5, 6, on the uselessness of providing retreats for the fallen unless you have more care against falling. It is said of us English that we begin at the wrong end. We have, such as they are, all sorts of Penitentiaries for the fallen, juvenile offenders, &c., &c. But where is our care to prevent falling? It has been said severely, 'A person must destroy his character, in order to become an object of English charity.' The life of these wretched ones is (horrible as it is to speak) a sort of profession. To draw off some few of them is doubtless a work of mercy to their souls sanctioned and blessed by our Lord Himself. But on a great scale you do nothing. You pluck out of the black, muddied, filthy stream, half-stified, a few unhappy beings; but it is only to make room for others to cast themselves into it, unless you begin at the other end to intercept them. The miserable number of 20,000 will be filled up, unless means be taken to save people from enlisting themselves in Satan's service. As you have butchers and bakers, so you will have these unhappy ones, until one class is taught to restrain their passions, or the others are made chaste. Either way you diminish their number. Else 'rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis, at ille labitur et labetur,' alas, not for all time only, but into eternity.

My own mind, then, has been turned into a different current from Mr. Armstrong's. I do feel that a true Penitentiary, which the unhappy ones need not leave, would be a great blessing, both to them and to the Church, as a token what enduring repentance is. I have wished for it, ever since I saw one under Roman Catholic Sisters in Ireland in 1841. But I have felt more strongly the need of providing for that most critical period of life, the development of the natural and spiritual life, when the girl is passing into the woman, and the child is to become the full-grown Christian, confirmed and a communicant. Here our National Schools just fail us, and just when there is most peril, they are left to themselves, to unlearn (amid the contamination of bad, crowded homes of which you speak, or of hard drudgery, where they are outcasts from the Church and of all means of self-improvement—I am speaking of great towns) all the good they had learnt, and learn all evil. At present, we teach in our schools, for the most part, only that our children may sin against the light.

I would not, then, discourage Penitentiaries, or anything God puts into people's hearts, to reclaim sinners; but for one Penitentiary, I should be glad to have ten abodes for training destitute poor female children. If we could but provide for orphans and children of first marriages! . . .

At times Pusey expressed himself almost impatiently on this topic. The Rev. W. Butler, at that time Vicar

of Wantage, asked him to preach at the anniversary of St. Mary's House—then a young institution, struggling to maintain itself in exceptional difficulties. Pusey in declining could say, with perfect truth, that he had no time to prepare such a sermon. But he added :—

‘Englishmen have a monomania about Penitentiaries. They do not stir a finger to prevent people from falling into the black pool, and then say, “See what we are doing !” if they drag one or another out to make room for fresh victims. People use Penitentiaries to blind themselves to their own apathy.’

Pusey did not of course mean that Penitentiaries were not institutions of great value. Both in Oxford and Devonport he spent a great deal of time and money in helping such institutions and those who were in them. But the complement to Penitentiaries was to be found, he held, in Orphanages: a home-like training in such an institution would save many who otherwise would afterwards need to find their way into Penitentiaries. He was especially interested—and remained so throughout his life—in the Orphanage of the Devonport Society. Commenced, as we have seen, at Devonport, the work was subsequently carried on for many years at St. Saviour's House, Osna-burgh Street, London; and finally, in 1877, established at Ascot Priory, Berks.

From the year 1855 onwards, until the death of Pusey, the older and most promising of the orphans were transplanted to the ‘Printing Press’ of the Devonport Society, a work which was commenced at Bradford-on-Avon, and in later years carried on at ‘Holy Rood,’ Oxford. The germ of this enterprise,—which has not survived its author, although it was for many years honourably associated with his literary and theological activity,—is thus referred to :—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church, June, 1855.

I have begun the plan of printing by women. The object is to find an additional employment for them in large towns, so as to save them from the temptation to eke out their narrow and insufficient wages by sin. The extent to which sin is thus occasioned is horrible. I hope

that the plan of gathering the young women into dormitories, and putting them under religious care, may, when it is seen, by God's blessing, to answer, be followed. The plan is a secret as yet. I have bought one of Marriott's presses (which have been a great expense to him), and the plan is being begun at Bristol, under the auspices of the Sisters.

Pusey rarely came into close contact with any of the forms of Dissent. He had never been engaged in parochial work: and apart from the regular cases of spiritual counsel, he was mainly consulted by persons who were perplexed by infidelity or by the claims of Rome. His feeling towards Dissenters was a kindly one. He was careful not to obscure any of the deficiencies of faith or of practice which belong to systematized Puritanism: but he gladly recognized the amount of revealed truth to which many of the separated bodies give their witness, and was painfully aware that their dissent is largely due to the shortcomings of the Church in past generations. The Irvingites were the only body with which he had controversy at this time. The religious system which owes its name to Edward Irving had largely emancipated itself from the traditions of its Presbyterian cradle. It was a body of a different type from the old Dissenting denominations, and even from Wesleyanism. It used the language of antiquity: it was not afraid of the principles of mysticism and beauty in religion: it enlisted art in its service, and held 'decency and order' to be attributes of Christian worship. Its strength lay in its belief in the power of the Holy Spirit resident in the Church of Christ to the end of time—a belief which is not the less important or true, because the form which it took in the Irvingite system was connected with some extravagancies. A near relative of the Dowager-Duchess of Argyll, who was much influenced by Pusey, was greatly attracted by the Irvingite system; and the Duchess wrote to Pusey for arguments that might have weight with her friend. Pusey thought the Irvingites a 'most impracticable body.' 'They make a schism, and will not own that they are making it.' In their supposed revival of the Apostolic office, 'they think they have some-

thing more than the whole Church : and so are losing God's gifts through her.' The Duchess was often staying at Frome Selwood, to which the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett had been appointed in 1851. Pusey, after his wont, felt it necessary to go thoroughly into the question that had been raised ; and he proposed to publish the result in a periodical which Mr. Bennett had set on foot—the *Church Porch*. But the *Church Porch* was a small publication ; and Pusey's articles had a habit of growing into pamphlets, or even volumes.

'The *Church Porch*,' he writes, 'is too small a vehicle for my long articles on Irvingism. The printer proposes to dissect my article on the tongues into three, so that I should not think many readers would remember in one article what I had written in the preceding.'

The attractive feature in Irvingism, at least in its early days, was the supposed revival, in the midst of our modern world, of those very gifts of healing, of tongues, and of prophecy, which were displayed in the Church of Corinth and elsewhere under the eyes of the Apostles. Whether these gifts were really revived or not was a question of fact ; and Pusey's criticism proceeds not upon any assumed impossibility in the revival, but upon lack of evidence that it had taken place.

'I am going,' he writes, 'through the so-called prophecies. My statement is this. No true prophet of God ever spoke as prophecy what was falsified by the event. The Irvingite prophecies have never been fulfilled, except when those who uttered them have had the power of fulfilling them : as, for instance, when they said, "there shall be apostles" ; and then, too, they were falsified ; for they said that the apostles should have the gift of *the* Apostles—miracles, &c.—and their so-called apostles have them not. Almighty God gave this as the test between the false prophets and His true prophets, that true prophecy should be fulfilled. Mr. Baxter's earlier book furnishes, I should think, some twenty or more circumstantial statements which they said would be fulfilled, and which were not. I wish your sister could look this argument in the face.'

It would seem that in the Irvingite movement, as at Corinth, the claim to the more pretentious gift of tongues had for some minds a greater attraction than the more sober gift of prophesying or preaching. Supposing it to be real,

it was a gift which readily lent itself to illusions; and this Pusey endeavoured to bring before the minds of his correspondents by a series of questions which ought, he thought, to be answered, before the gift was taken for granted. A great deal of stress was laid also upon the 'acts of healing,' which were alleged to have taken place, and which were, it was contended, of a strictly miraculous character. Pusey had questions to ask about these too, no less than about the tongues.

A little later Pusey writes to his son:—

'I am busy about Irvingism. I have finished my second article (on "tongues"); and am writing the third on their so-called prophesyings. A fourth will be on their heresies: a fifth, on the apostolic succession in answer to their claim for apostles.'

Pusey appears at one time to have contemplated a considerable work on this subject. He contributed eleven papers to the *Old Church Porch*; whence they were extracted to take a somewhat more permanent form in the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett's work on 'The Church's Broken Unity.'

Another of his correspondents at this time was the Rev. Arthur Baker, who had been on the staff of the clergy of Margaret Chapel, where he was distinguished for his general devotion and for the power and spirituality of his sermons. He seems to have been influenced by the idea that 'Purgatory as taught in the Roman Church was a special source of comfort, as holding out a hope of salvation to those desiring to be holy, but who are often falling.' This idea appeared to Pusey to be both vague and misleading; and he set himself to show that, whether on Anglican or on Roman grounds, it seemed unwarranted.

E. B. P. TO REV. A. BAKER.

About 1852.

I was studying Roman divines of authority last year on the subject, and what I set down was what I gathered from them, that they believed that (1) none entered Purgatory who did not leave this life in a state of grace; (2) that there was no growth in grace there; (3) that it was a state of *satispassio*, in which these souls stayed until the definite temporal debt was paid.

Plainly, there will be a great change when this corruptible body is put off, and with it and the close of this life the *fomes peccati* is put off, and the soul is fixed in the unchangeable, unvarying love of God. Our bodies too will be changed in the Resurrection. But what I wished to guard against, in that note, and my very object in writing it, was that the doctrine of Purgatory held out a hope of salvation to those who would not be saved otherwise.

Now both Roman divines and ours believe that all those and those only will be saved who, when they die, are in a state of grace. Almighty God knows who these are. They must be known to Him. They are already in a state of grace in this life. In what way He will fit them for the full fruition of Himself is a distinct question. But the number of those who *are* in a state of grace now is a certain number, certainly known to Almighty God. It is a *present fact*. It cannot depend upon what is future. Since what follows after this life does not change the fact in this life, the number of the saved cannot be increased by it.

The danger of 'often falling' (if the falls are of that deep sort, of which Holy Scripture says, 'They who do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God') is lest they who so fall should at last grieve away the Spirit of God, and have not the grace to repent any more. This is the danger as relates to final salvation. There is the other danger, that they should lose that degree of bliss and the eternal love of God, which, by patient perseverance in the grace of God, they might have had.

Neither of these dangers are in the least met by the doctrine of Purgatory. If a person have sinned away the grace of God, he will not be saved on any system. The reward also in heaven, 'the crown of righteousness,' will be proportioned to the deeds done in the body. There is no attainment (nothing which is meant by *meritum*) in the world to come. As a man sows, so shall he reap.

Mr. Baker was on the point of leaving England for New Zealand, where he worked for six years under Bishop Selwyn. He might never see England and Pusey again: and his mind dwelt much on the anxious question of what would happen after death. Pusey had to return to the subject. The mischief of such expressions as Mr. Baker used was that they suggested that

'what is neglected here, may be so supplied there as to affect the measure of a person's eternal happiness. The more any one grows in grace here, the greater will be his eternal happiness. The reward there will be in proportion to his use of grace here. Neglect of grace here at one time may be compensated by greater diligence subsequently in this life. But the state of the soul is absolutely fixed by death, (1) whether it shall be lost or saved; (2) what shall be its final degree of bliss.'

In a third letter Pusey repeats himself; but his thought runs clearer as he writes and rewrites it :—

‘Whatever there is in this life of repentance, faithfulness to grace, love, deeds of love, brings with it growth in grace and greater capacity of future bliss. Nothing in the intermediate state can compensate for this, if lost. Both a person’s salvation and the degree of bliss are fixed here. “The patient endurance of suffering for the love of God, and penitential sorrow” in this life, do, through the operation of the grace of God, enlarge the soul (whatever its present capacity is) for a larger participation of Almighty God. *This* is fixed in this life. To look then for that to be done in the intermediate state which ought to be done here, is to undergo loss. R. C.s say, “it is through the remissness of a soul that it goes to Purgatory at all.” But what it loses in this life, it cannot recover. Through patient endurance and penitential sorrow, or deeds of love for the love of God here, the soul gains eternally, through the grace of God, larger measures of bliss. Whatever is lost here, is lost for eternity.

‘I believe that your expression “growth in grace” would be accounted incorrect by R. C. writers, being limited [by them] to a state of probation. It implies that exercise of will and choice which belong to the state of probation only.

‘You will not think me over-critical if I say that the expression “a course of purifying *penitential* processes, extending it may be into the intermediate state,” is incorrect, even on Roman grounds. There is no repentance, no penitential process, in the grave.

‘I am anxious about this both on its own account, because I think that it would be misleading; and because I fear that in New Zealand, where they have had none of this teaching, it might occasion trouble both to yourself and others. I fear that it would be a subject of anxiety to the Bishop, who has been winning people so wonderfully, and that his work would be hindered by any teaching which implied a belief in a state of Purgatory. I suppose that you would feel no difficulty in teaching what our Church teaches in common with the rest of Christendom as to the great truths of faith and practice, without touching upon these subjects.’

Pusey had been forced unwillingly into incessant controversy; but no one was more conscious than himself that it was not in the atmosphere of controversy nor in the promotion merely of theological study, that any real improvement in the Church must be expected: it must begin with greater strictness of life among the clergy. Only those who were living for God, he said, could persuade other men to live for Him. For this reason in July, 1856, what is believed to be the first attempt at a Retreat for Clergy in the later

English Church was made under his auspices. Seventeen or eighteen clergymen were present, and were lodged and fed at his house in Christ Church. They met at half-past six, to say Prime and prepare for Holy Communion. Then the whole party attended a celebration at St. Thomas' Church at seven, remaining in church after the service for about half an hour for prayer. Returning to Pusey's, they said Thanksgiving for Communion, and Terce over, breakfast followed, during which a meditation was read. Then they went to the Cathedral service at ten, returning to Sext, and a 'conference,' which lasted until two or three o'clock. It was on some such subject as conversion or confession. Dinner, during which there was spiritual reading, was followed by Nones and afternoon service at the Cathedral; after which the whole party took a short walk, returned to tea, to another 'conference' and Compline, and so went to bed. This was repeated every day for a week. The Rev. Charles Lowder, who describes it, says that it was an especial help to him before entering on his great work at St. George's Mission¹. As compared with modern Retreats it was obviously deficient: meditations are better than conferences; and if souls are to deal faithfully with God and with themselves a rule of silence is a practical necessity. But in this, as in so much else, Pusey led the way to spiritual opportunities which are now, and without question, placed within the reach of all English Churchmen.

¹ 'Life of Rev. C. Lowder,' p. 96.

CHAPTER XV.

THE UNIVERSITY REFORM ACT OF 1854.

Christ's Church was holiest in her youthful days,
Ere the world on her smiled ;
So now, an outcast, she would pour her rays,
More keen and undefiled ;
Yet would I not that hand of force were mine
Which thrusts her from her ancient, awful shrine.

Lyra Apostolica, cxxxi.

THE probability that there would be some Parliamentary interference with the old constitution and arrangements of Oxford had long been recognized. The most conservative of Oxford men had been made to feel by the events of the last few years that it was absolutely necessary that some great change should be made in the government of the University. The Hebdomadal Board had been discredited by its actions in the Tractarian controversy in the eyes even of many who did not sympathize with the Oxford Movement. On the other hand, there were some to whom the entire constitution and arrangements of the University were distasteful. Lord John Russell was generally credited with the opinion that the Tractarian movement was partly due to the old constitution of the University as consolidated by Laud, and to the Statutes of the Colleges, the majority of which dated from before the Reformation. In this opinion there was this element of truth. Both Laud's work and the College Statutes were mainly a survival of the religious and disciplinary rules of an earlier age, with only such modifications as reform in the abuses of the Church

necessarily involved. Hence the anti-Catholic and Latitudinarian parties disliked just those elements of the old Oxford which the Tractarians would have wished to retain. The Colleges were, in their eyes, relics of a 'mischievous mediævalism, inconsistent with the healthy temper and wider views of modern European life.' Judged also from another point of view, as centres of study and learning, the richly endowed Universities of England were felt to have but a low standard and to be doing inadequate work, although there was a wide difference of opinion as to the best method of improvement. And thus those who disliked them on religious grounds were reinforced by others whose objections were of a different order.

On Aug. 31, 1850, a Commission was appointed by the Queen to inquire into the state, discipline, studies, and revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford. The Commissioners were generally Liberal in politics, and more or less Latitudinarian in theology¹. They spent a year and eight months in collecting such evidence as they could get; but, as their proceedings were viewed by the majority of Oxford residents with more or less suspicion and distrust, many important sources of information were closed to them. They presented their report, however, on April 27, 1852; and, before making that report a basis of legislation, the Government allowed some time to elapse, in order that the University might collectively, or through its more eminent members, express its opinion on the subject. The Hebdomadal Board accordingly appointed a delegacy, to which evidence was tendered by many distinguished persons who had refused to have any communication with the Royal Commissioners; and by this delegacy a report was made to the Board, and subsequently printed in a thick octavo volume. Pusey would have been glad to give evidence before the Commissioners; but he appears to have had no oppor-

¹ They were Dr. Hinds, Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Tait, Dr. Jeune, Rev. H. G. Liddell, J. L. Dampier, Esq.,

Professor Baden Powell, Rev. G. H. S. Johnson. The Rev. A. P. Stanley was Secretary to the Commission.

tunity of doing so. He therefore offered it to the delegacy of the Hebdomadal Board. In point of bulk his evidence formed the largest contribution to the Hebdomadal volume¹: and, as was observed at the time, it differed from other contributions in kind no less than in degree. Men who did not sympathize with its drift and object could not but acknowledge the proof it afforded of vast and varied knowledge, of intellectual acumen, and of a grasp of the main points at issue. Others addressed themselves to isolated points in the Commissioners' Report: Pusey had dealt with it as a whole and in its most essential characteristics.

He saw that the two really important questions raised by the report were whether Oxford education should be collegiate or professorial, and whether it should be lay or clerical.

He discusses the first point in an historical review of University education in Germany, whence in fact had been derived the ideal that was before the minds of the Commissioners. In the German University the professor was everything: and Pusey contends that this system failed adequately to stimulate the active powers of the mind of students, created successive schools of thought but no authoritative literature, and involved serious dangers not only to the faith but to the morals of students.

He contrasts the mental effect of lectures orally delivered by professors with that of the study of a classical text:—

‘The object of lectures orally delivered is simply to convey information. They presuppose that the mind is already formed. The mind is simply a recipient. It digests, at most, at some subsequent time (if it ever does), what it then receives. For the time, its faculties are mainly employed in grasping and remembering what is imparted to it. It can only, at most, and that on the easiest points, exercise a rapid judgment, in passing, on what is proposed to it. If the lecture be new to the hearer, or at all taxes his powers, all his efforts are employed in retaining a portion of it. He has not (as in the case of catechetical

¹ Pusey was conscious of this: ‘I have written,’ he wrote to Keble, ‘a long elaborate essay of 170 close octavo pages.’ He urges Keble to write, and to induce others to write, such as Sir J. Coleridge, Sir J. Awdry, Sir

W. Heathcote, Dr. Moberly. What was needed was ‘the sound judgment of matured minds, not the opinions of young, professor-bitten minds.’ Pusey to Keble, June, 1853.

teaching) to compare any thoughts which he may have formed, with those of a maturer mind. The mind is passive, not active¹.

He urges therefore that

‘The difference of the intellectual benefit between the cursory attendance upon a *delivered* lecture on the one hand and on the other that repeated and renewed effort and strain of mind in considering again and again the more thoughtful passages of a solid book, then surveying the argument as a whole, and then again pausing upon its more solid and weighty parts, or again its minuter excellences, or its abstruser points—will be estimated by any one who will reflect upon the process at any time in his own mind. It is incalculable. Even in this respect the lectures of professors are, as a study, inferior to their written books².’

The professoriate in Protestant Germany had led, Pusey maintained, to a widespread doubt of the certainty of any knowledge, alike in theology and philosophy. When illustrating this position, he traces the history of German Protestant theology and philosophy; the one from the Reformation, the other from the rise of the Wolfian philosophy. The Lutheranism of the Formula Concordiae, the school of Halle, the lectures and influence of Baumgarten, Semler, Michaelis, Eichhorn, were successively illustrations of influences which had only existed to die away. In philosophy, Wolfianism had been succeeded by the popular philosophy; this by Kant, Kant by Fichte, by Schelling, by Hegel in succession. Nothing had remained beyond the impression that nothing was certain. The passages which illustrate this are too long for quotation, but they repay perusal, and they show how extensive was Pusey’s knowledge of the history of modern German thought. This instability of all representations, whether of theological or philosophical truth, had arrested the production of a literature that could be recognized as classical and authoritative. When, during his stay in Germany, Pusey had asked the Germans about their standard books in theology:—

¹ Rep. and Ev. before Hebd. Board, ‘Evidence,’ pp. 5, 6.

² Ibid., p. 8.

'There was nothing. Whatever there had been in the previous centuries was swept away. No account was then taken of any book, except what had been published in the last twenty-five years. No book written before that time was to be found in Berlin, except in one obscure little shop; at Göttingen, or Bonn, none; nor were they ordinarily to be obtained, except in one great 'antiquarian' shop at Leipzig, or occasionally at auctions. Rumours had then reached England of some unknown amount of sacred criticism in Germany; but when I came to ask the more thoughtful of them, it was owned that there was next to nothing. Yet the system of professorial lectures in theology had been going on since the Reformation; year by year, lectures had been given in all the different chairs of Germany; but wave had followed wave, and all had disappeared. I recollect the mutual surprise when the more thoughtful among them learnt from me, that in England we studied chiefly old books, and I learnt from them that they used none. If they asked of me how we studied theology, they were surprised to hear of standard, solid writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as Hooker or Bull, Butler or Pearson, and they said, "That is something beautiful." It was to me, at that time, something strange and mournful that they had no past.

'Certainly, to speak of theology, if, as has been said¹, part of the value of the professorial system is to produce books, it was a total failure; for there had been none which survived².'

As to the effect of this system on religious faith, Pusey recalls his own experience, while in Germany:—

'In 1825 (and so after the revival, though the new school had for some years begun), one who wished to recount all who, in any sense, could be accounted supporters of Christianity, or (as they were called), "orthodox" among the professors, made them amount to seventeen only, in all Protestant Germany. Among them was Marheineke, and some others, who in no other country would have been accounted orthodox. "We Orientalists," said another in my hearing, who became afterwards a distinguished Oriental professor, "are but bad Christians." I believe that a young Roman Catholic student and myself were the only believers in the lecture-room when it was said, although another was afterwards converted³.'

Again, the professor was not responsible for the moral conduct of his pupil: there was no such relation between teacher and taught as was implied in the tutorial system of the English Universities. The results might be anticipated.

'I see then,' Pusey concludes, 'no result, intellectual, moral, or religious, for which we should be invited to imitate the plan of the

¹ 'Report,' p. 97.

² 'Evidence' presented to Hebd. Board, pp. 9, 10.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

German Universities. We have been told much of their powers of speculation and their philosophy. We may ask, which they would recommend to us? They have tired, we are told, of all. Or is it for their sacred criticism? We might ask again, in what theory as to Holy Scripture, or any part of it, they acquiesce? or their research? We might ask what modern history they would give us in preference to our own? or ethics? We may still ask what system they adopt? We have been told that "*we* have no history of doctrines¹." We may ask, what doctrines they are agreed upon? Since the result of research, diligence, instruction is assured, and solid knowledge, we may well abide by our own system until we see, not in theory only, but in its fruits, that another forms the mind more solidly, maintains its independence better, while aiding it to think aright, encompasses it with religious influences without forcing it, or yields more religious solid knowledge than that contained in our English divines, the ultimate result of the training of our Universities and of residence in them.

'We have abundance of theories about the professorial system. We have no facts of its having produced any but evil fruits. The training of our youth, the intellectual, moral, religious formation of their minds, their future well-being in this world and the world to come, are not matters upon which to try experiments².'

The other question to which Pusey addressed himself was whether education given in the Universities should be lay or clerical. The Commissioners had urged that the clerical restrictions on fellowships were objectionable on three grounds. They led some men to receive Holy Orders from the unworthy motive of desiring to hold a fellowship. They excluded from the service of a College persons whose calling might be to literary work, but not to Holy Orders. Further, a predominance of clergy tended to promote theological controversy.

To the first objection Pusey replies that if the elections to fellowships were rightly conducted, the temptation to take Holy Orders from unworthy motives could not exist; and that the argument of the Commissioners told much more strongly against private patronage of livings. To the second, that already more fellowships were held by laymen than were needed to meet any cases of non-clerical persons who felt called to literary labours. Most lay-fellows were non-resident, rendering no apparent services either to their

¹ 'Report,' p. 71.

² Rep. and Ev. before Heb. Board, 'Evidence,' pp. 63, 64.

College or the University. As to a tendency to religious controversy, it was independent of the question whether a man was a clergyman or a layman. Controversy was to be found everywhere, and on all subjects. It need not be angry or spiteful. It would cease, no doubt, if, as at times in Germany, men had ceased altogether to care about religion.

Pusey observes that the evidence before the Commissioners testifies to the feeling of the country in favour of clerical instructors. He adds:—

‘The grounds of this preference of the clergy as educators are two-fold: (1) because those who have devoted themselves to that sacred calling are presumed (whatever individual defects there may be) to be likely to *train* the young more religiously than the average of other men; (2) because all subjects of study may be taught religiously or irreligiously, and it is supposed that persons, pledged as the clergy are, will, on the whole, *teach* more religiously¹.’

He adds afterwards:—

‘Meiners quotes a French writer², who speaks of it as a gain, that “theology and philosophy ceased to be a monopoly of monks, and were taught by seculars”; and that the seculars “belonging to no ecclesiastical order, could abandon themselves the more freely to the impulse of their genius, and hazard fearlessly novel opinions.” The French Revolution, the empire of “the Goddess of Reason,” and the blind and fanatical following of any new meteor-light, to the almost utter destruction of faith among the learned in Germany, were the results of that “hazard.” It was a “hazard” in which all was staked, and for the time was lost³.’

Pusey, of course, did not deny that the existing educational system of Oxford admitted of great improvement: he only desired that this improvement should proceed on sound principles.

‘It is right that Oxford should embrace all who will come to her to be educated in her way; it is right that she should enlarge her studies, by taking in, in their order and degree, those parts of study which can be combined with her system, and which may help to expand, cultivate, strengthen, consolidate, and, if rightly used, elevate the mind. It is well that she should help the student even to lay a solid foundation for his future special study. Only let it be really

¹ Rep. and Ev. before Hebd. Board, ‘Evidence,’ § 276, p. 128.

² Hafner, ‘de l’Education Publique,’ p. 7.

³ Rep. and Ev. before Hebd. Board, ‘Evidence,’ p. 131.

solid, and, above all, under the control of a firm, unwavering faith, to the glory of God. It will yet be well with Oxford, if she forget not her own motto—" *Dominus illuminatio mea*¹."

Another body of residents, called the Tutors' Association, of which the Rev. C. Marriott was an active member, had frequent meetings and issued a report, which criticized the proposals of the Commissioners for a new Governing Body of the University. This twofold attack on the Commission naturally provoked rejoinders, and the Commissioners were fortunate in finding a champion at once so independent and so able as Professor H. H. Vaughan².

Professor Vaughan was a favourable representative of the academical Liberalism, which was now rising at Oxford in opposition alike to the Toryism of the Hebdomadal Board and the religious principles of the Church Movement. He saw at a glance that the most considerable, if not the only considerable, opponent with whom he had to reckon was Pusey; and the bulk of his pamphlet is devoted to an analysis of Pusey's 'Evidence,' which he hints ought to have been called a 'treatise.' Against Pusey he endeavours to maintain with varying success that professorial lectures are good, if not the best, instruments for communicating knowledge; and that they administer a discipline of a certain kind to the mental faculties which is not to be gained by the study of books. That professors have aided the advancement of truth, and that professorial activity had produced books of lasting value, is, it must be thought, made good by their accomplished advocate: but the controversy only approaches its centre when Professor Vaughan discusses Pusey's position, that the theological professoriate in Protestant Germany had been a main cause of misbelief and scepticism. Here Professor Vaughan changes his method, which has hitherto been that of direct investigation, for a series of *ad hominem* arguments. Had not Pusey been delivered into his hands by the 'Theology of Ger-

¹ 'Evidence,' § 370, p. 173.

² 'Oxford Reform and Oxford Professors,' by H. H. Vaughan, M.A.,

Regius Professor of Modern History.
London, Parker, 1854.

many'? In that work the causes of Rationalism had been represented to be dead orthodoxy and English Deism, while the professors were described as not 'having done so much evil as good,' and their activity was hailed as a new era in theology. As to the influence of professors on morality, Professor Vaughan maintains that 'tutorial' Oxford had been, to say the least, no better than professorial Germany. Attached to his pamphlet is an 'Appendix,' the most interesting paper in which, 'On the Scholarship of Germany,' is contributed by Mr., afterwards Professor, Conington, and a 'Postscript,' in which, with questionable freedom, Professor Vaughan publishes some private letters of Pusey's without his leave.

Pusey's reply¹ to Professor Vaughan is the most considerable work he produced on the subject of University Education. To the Professor's strictures it is at least an adequate reply. He begins by showing that Professor Vaughan had wholly or in part misstated the deductions which were warranted by the evidence under review. On each point in dispute he restates, explains, expands, by means of proof and illustration, his original meaning: and it would be difficult to point to any other equally solid defence of the old Collegiate system of our English Universities. After meeting Professor Vaughan's allegations point by point respecting the alleged corruption of Colleges in France, he refutes the charge against English Collegiate life which had been made by Meiners, a copious and original writer, who ranks among the most distinguished members of the University of Göttingen, where he had died sixteen years before Pusey's visit in 1826. Pusey had quoted Meiners in his evidence on a subject about which that writer could speak with authority, namely, the evil results of lay teaching of philosophy and divinity in the Universities of Protestant Germany. Professor Vaughan had retaliated by quoting Meiners' bad opinion of the Collegiate system in the English Universities. But on this subject, as well as upon

¹ 'Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline: in answer to Prof. Vaughan's strictures.' Oxford, Parker, 1854.

that of the French Colleges, Meiners had to depend upon secondhand and bad sources of information ; as Pusey shows, he had mainly relied on two early eighteenth-century lampoons, in his attacks upon Colleges in England. Professor Vaughan, who apparently first heard of Meiners from Pusey, had no such knowledge as would enable him to make a discriminating use of his new authority, and quoted his least trustworthy conclusions with a childlike confidence which Pusey's analysis must have rudely disturbed.

Professor Vaughan had been scarcely more successful in his endeavour to employ Pusey's earlier work on Germany in disparagement of his evidence before the Delegacy. However much Pusey's estimate of the value of German Protestant theology might have changed since 1828, he did not, as Professor Vaughan asserted, propose to add a new cause of German Rationalism, to those which he had already assigned to it.

'The statement in my Evidence is not inconsistent with those in my Enquiry. In 1827 [1828] I was speaking of the *causes* of Rationalism ; in 1853 I was speaking of the *agents*. It is no contradiction to speak at one time of the distant spring of water ; at another, of the pipes which convey it. Cholera or the plague have been brought in cotton goods. It is not thought irrational to enquire how they were *immediately* conveyed ; nor is one who so enquires supposed to be assigning the *ultimate* physical cause which generated the disease. It is as I have said, a fact, that "almost¹ all those, through whom Rationalism was nurtured, developed, ripened, were professors." "The Rationalistic writers of any name, who were not professors, were placed in their offices by the Crown." The professors who really resisted Rationalism were almost as few as the pastors who *actively* "promoted it." If any can show this not to have been so, let them show it. If not, it is a phenomenon which remains to be solved in some way².'

On one or two subjects which Pusey handles, such as the advisability of private Halls, and of the admission to the University of non-collegiate students, his judgment has been more or less refuted by experience ; in fact it was not a little modified even by himself as years went on. But the leading positions of his book are of a different character,

¹ 'Evidence,' p. 73.

² 'Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline,' p. 55.

and so long as men are interested in endeavouring to decide what it is that they propose to themselves as the proper work of Universities they will read him with interest and profit.

Nor will his readers be less struck by the admirable tone of his controversial method. In no other work does he shew more effectively how the resource and acuteness of a practised controversialist may be combined with those qualities of gentleness and consideration for others which mark the true Christian. He also shews to better advantage in the matter of style than in most of his published works. Indeed there are few passages in controversial literature stronger or more luminous than that with which Pusey replies to the taunt that he was treating an academical question from a 'theological' point of view:—

'To myself, some have thought it enough to answer that I have looked upon the question "in a theological aspect." Undoubtedly. God alone *is* in Himself, and is the Cause and Upholder of everything to which He has given being. Every faculty of the mind is some reflection of His; every truth has its being from Him; every law of nature has the impress of His hand; everything beautiful has caught its light from His eternal beauty; every principle of goodness has its foundation in His attributes. He, by nature, is above all, through all, in all, by His Being; as He is in His own, by His Grace. He is the Author of all, the End of all, and of our own being individually. Without Him, in the region of thought, everything is dead; as without Him everything which is, would at once cease to be. All things must speak of God, refer to God, or they are atheistic. History, without God, is a chaos without design, or end, or aim. Political Economy, without God, would be a selfish teaching about the acquisition of wealth, making the larger portion of mankind animate machines for its production; Physics, without God, would be but a dull enquiry into certain meaningless phenomena; Ethics, without God, would be a varying rule, without principle, or substance, or centre, or regulating hand; Metaphysics, without God, would make man his own temporary god, to be resolved, after his brief hour here, into the nothingness out of which he proceeded. All sciences may do good service, if those who cultivate them know their place, and carry them not beyond their sphere; all may, in different degrees, tend to cultivate the human mind, although no one human mind has time or capacity for all. But all will become antagonistic to truth, if they are deified by their votaries; all will tend to exclude the thought of God, if they are not cultivated with reference to Him. History will become an account of man's passions and brute strength, instead of the ordering of God's

providence for His creatures' good ; Physics will materialize man, and Metaphysics, God. . . . The object of an University is not simply or mainly to cultivate the intellect. Intellect, by itself, heightened, sharpened, refined, cool, piercing, subtle, would be after the likeness, not of God, but of His enemy, who is acuter and subtler far, than the acutest and the subtlest. The object of Universities is, with and through the discipline of the intellect, as far as may be, to discipline and train the whole moral and intelligent being. The problem and special work of an University is, not how to advance science, not how to make discoveries, not to form new schools of mental philosophy, nor to invent new modes of analysis ; not to produce works in Medicine, Jurisprudence, or even Theology ; but to form minds religiously, morally, intellectually, which shall discharge aright whatever duties God, in His Providence, shall appoint to them. Acute and subtle intellects, even though well-disciplined, are not needed for most offices in the body politic. Acute and subtle intellects, if undisciplined, are destructive both to themselves and to it, in proportion to their very powers. The type of the best English intellectual character is sound, solid, steady, thoughtful, patient, well-disciplined judgment. It would be a perversion of our institutions to turn the University into a forcing-house for intellect.

'What we need is to strengthen our institutions, not to revolutionize them ; to replace anything decayed, not to build anew ; to reform anything amiss, not to remodel them. Sudden changes are for His hands alone, Who can recreate, as He created, very good : Who can sustain the mind which He remoulds, or bear His own Ark over the floods which He creates¹.'

There is another good passage in which he recalls some words of Archbishop Howley that had been much canvassed in the secular press of the day :—

'The intellect, as Bishop Butler pointed out, has its trials as well as the moral powers of man. Pride of intellect, or self-confidence, is a more subtle evil than the coarser passions. People have justified intellectually the indulgence of their passions ; they *must*, by a moral necessity, if they give way to them. They *cannot* mistake as to the *existence* of their passions, or the fact that they give way to them. People *are* very commonly mistaken and ignorant as to their intellectual faults or sins. In our time, men continually do not seem to have a notion that the intellect, too, must be subdued to God. Within our memory, the late Archbishop of Canterbury (when Bishop of London) was assailed with a torrent of censure from the intellectual press, because he insisted on "the *prostration* of the human understanding" before the revelation of God. His term expressed precisely the truth, that the human intellect must have no reserves of its own ;

¹ 'Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline,' pp. 215, 216.

it must not make terms with God ; it must not receive all revelation except just the one point, perhaps, which it does not like, or which it cannot square with its own notions¹.

In subsequent correspondence with the Rev. A. P. Stanley, Secretary to the Royal Commission, Pusey calls attention to these passages as expressing his own deepest feeling.

E. B. P. TO REV. A. P. STANLEY.

Thank you for the kind close of your letter. All kindness and loving feeling is a treasure in this world of pain.

It has been the painful part of writing this answer that I felt I must pain or in some way annoy Professor Vaughan. I have taken pains to avoid it as far as I could. . . .

In proportion as there is hope that science should be religious, I should be glad to see science established at Oxford. I have no fears from it. Of course, it ought to do good service, if it knows its own province. . . .

I can assure you that I approached the Commission in no unfriendly spirit. I should have been glad, beforehand, if I might, to have addressed to the Commission remarks which were eventually directed against its recommendations. Controversy is not a congenial element to me. I wrote as I did, simply because I dreaded exceedingly the moral and religious effects of their recommendations.

God guide us all aright in this crisis of Oxford.

This letter is noticeable as being an early expression of the view that Pusey always entertained of the introduction of Natural Science into the studies of Oxford.

Among the proposals of the Commissioners was one for remodelling the government of the University. The Hebdomadal Board was to remain, but only for the purposes of maintaining discipline and transacting ordinary business. The right of initiating measures was to be shared with a remodelled Congregation, consisting of the authorized teachers of the University, as well as the Heads of Houses and Proctors. As this proposal was accompanied by others for increasing the professoriate and the control of the Crown over the appointment of its members, the scheme as a whole was regarded as designed to make over the control of the University to a body in which Crown-nominees would exert a preponderating influence.

¹ 'Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline,' p. 73.

Pusey, in his evidence before the Delegacy, had proposed a rival scheme, of a more conservative character. The Hebdomadal Board was to retain all its old powers: but Pusey wished to create a new body, equal in number to the Hebdomadal Board, but elected by and from among resident members of Convocation. This body was to share with the Hebdomadal Board the right of proposing measures to Convocation: and all measures to be so proposed were to be passed by the two Boards, either separately, or in case of difference of opinion, by a majority of their members at a joint meeting. The main features of the proposal were first its retention of the old polity of the University, excepting the provision for the initiation of measures by representatives of Convocation, and secondly the refusal to make the authorized teachers, in other words, the professors, a separate estate in the University.

This scheme, which, in its original form, appears to have been mentioned to Pusey by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Cotton, was, early in 1854, adopted in substance as their own by the Hebdomadal Board¹. The Board resolved to obtain, if they could, a judgment of the University in favour of what was now their own proposal, in order to influence the legislation which the Government was understood to be preparing. A petition to the Crown, in favour of the proposals of the Board, was laid before Convocation on February 24, 1854. Pusey strained every nerve to secure the success of the proposal.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church [Feb. 16, 1854].

I am very heavy about things. I must still struggle on, and tomorrow (Friday) week will decide about the Constitution. It seems to me important in different ways; (1) as coming from the University, not from Government; (2) as more conservative than any other, and then all the reasons which I gave in my evidence. But there is a disposition here, even among those whom I should least have

¹ The Hebdomadal scheme originally differed from Pusey's (1) in making eight professors, elected by all the professors, members of the new Board;

(2) in making the whole Convocation, and not merely the residents, elect the fifteen representatives of Convocation.

expected, as Haddan, to wait for the Government measure, as giving the Tutors, &c. better terms, i.e. more power. I hope that you will be able to come and support the plan of the two Boards which is to come before Convocation on Friday week.

Keble and Pusey both wrote strongly in favour of the petition: and their letters brought up a sufficient number of non-resident members of Convocation to carry it, on Feb. 24, 1854, but only by a majority of fifty-one.

Though Pusey had the majority on his side, there were many of his old friends on the other side. The defeated minority contained, not only the representatives of the extreme non-religious academical Liberalism, but staunch adherents of the Church movement. These latter could not understand Pusey's effort to save the Hebdomadal Board, which 'had checked so triumphantly the progress of Puseyism by sentences of suspension and degradation, at the same time that it allowed Rationalism full swing by accepting without a word the Bampton Lectures of 1851.' They were not pleased to see him in close alliance with persons who had been in various scenes prominent in the anti-Catholic crusade of former years: their imaginations were fired by visions of a renovated Oxford, of open fellowships, hard-working fellows, active professors, multiplied students, varied studies, improved discipline, augmented influence—yet at the same time 'an Oxford in close connexion with the Church, and sending men forth with much the same spirit and cast of mind as at present.'

There were strange alliances on both sides. Many of the younger adherents of the Movement found themselves in company with keen and powerful minds that were already projecting a very different Oxford from that of their devout imagination. Pusey had less reason than any man still resident in Oxford to remember with gratitude or respect the proceedings of the Hebdomadal Board in past years. But he did not lose sight of the value of institutions or of principles because one generation of their representatives had made grave mistakes; and the fact that these mistakes

had brought upon himself much wholly unmerited distress would only have disturbed the balance of his judgment by inclining it to favour their authors. Still he could not share the Utopian visions of a renovated Oxford in which some younger Churchmen ingenuously revelled: he knew too well what intellectual and moral forces were likely ere long to come upon the scene to permit himself a passing moment of such illusion. Keble, who had at first hesitated, was now heartily with him. 'You may vote against Pusey,' he said on this occasion, to a young member of Convocation, 'but I am very sure that if God spares your life, and gives you a right mind, you will live to regret it.'

But Pusey's altered relations with the old Hebdomadal Board was a fact patent to all the world. Newman noticed the change from his retreat in Dublin, where he had been advocating in lectures of unrivalled skill and beauty the old Oxford ideal of education.

REV. J. H. NEWMAN TO E. B. P.

11 Harcourt Street, Dublin, March 11, 1854.

MY DEAR PUSEY,

I hope you will receive very shortly a copy of my 'Discourses on University Education,' to which you allude, if you will kindly accept it. I should value much your answer to Vaughan. I have read the Report of the Heads of Houses, and smiled to find that after all the rubs they had given you, they were at last obliged to have recourse to you as their best champion. . . .

Ever affectionately yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Keble, as being more nearly concerned, wrote more seriously. 'I am very sorry that you have such impracticable and damaging allies as the Heads of Houses.' The Heads were not 'impracticable' in one sense, at any rate on this occasion. They gratefully welcomed Pusey's evidence, and assigned to it the place of honour in their Report¹.

¹ No one, they observe, had discussed the respective merits of the Professorial and Tutorial systems so fully as the Professor of Hebrew, and they note 'the great care and ability'

with which he had stated the advantages of an intermediate Board. 'Report and Evidence upon the Recommendations of H.M. Commissioners,' pp. 63, 81, 104, &c.

At a slightly earlier stage in the discussion, Mr. Justice Coleridge had expressed himself in the same sense, but with more deliberation. When replying to Pusey's request that he would vote for the Hebdomadal Board's petition to the Queen, he replied that

'Past experience leads me to have great distrust of the Hebdomadal Board, and that has been increased by their conduct in this present crisis. I find it difficult to believe them to be sincerely ready to make their power less, or less exclusive, which yet I think essential to good government in the University.'

After some criticisms on the Hebdomadal proposal, he adds:—

'I am much concerned that you feel so sad about Oxford prospects—no one ought to be a better judge than yourself, who have been an observer and a partaker in Oxford affairs so many years. Yet I will still hope that your fears may prove unfounded. At such a moment it is to be expected that there will be excitement among the young, and able, and active—that there may be mixed up in what they do and feel, some prejudices, much ambition, personal hopes, and even personal dislikes. This is the common necessity of such times—but surely there is much of goodwill and honest purpose, too, stirring active people.'

On March 17, 1854, when the shadow of the Crimean war had already fallen upon the country, the Government of Lord Aberdeen produced its Bill for the Reform of the University of Oxford. Measured by the other reforms which have since been carried, the Bill was certainly moderate in its provisions. Besides creating a new Hebdomadal Council, and, at least in its main features¹, the body to which it applied the ancient name of Congregation, the Bill provided that any qualified Master of Arts might open a private Hall, that one half the fellowships in the University should be absolutely open, and that the obligation to take Holy Orders should be relaxed to the extent of one quarter of the fellowships in any College.

Pusey disliked the whole Bill: but he particularly objected to the proposals for dealing with fellowships, and for licensing private Halls. The former threatened the

¹ Congregation as proposed in the Bill was projected on wider and wiser lines than were eventually accepted by Parliament.

religious faith the latter, as he thought, the discipline of the University. If experience has not ratified his fears about the Halls, it has more than confirmed his apprehensions about the fellowships¹.

Before the Bill was introduced into the House, Pusey had a long correspondence with Mr. Gladstone, who as Chancellor of the Exchequer had a large share of direct responsibility for the Bill, while as Burgess for the University he owed some account of it to his constituents, and especially to those who, like Pusey, had not a little promoted his election. Pusey had learnt what the provisions of the Bill would be from a published correspondence between the Government and the Hebdomadal Board. He had sent Mr. Gladstone his evidence before the Delegacy: and, as the Bill took shape, its main provisions were successively discussed between them in friendly terms, which, however, did not conceal an increasing divergence of opinion. Pusey wished Mr. Gladstone to induce the Government to abandon the proposal for private Halls; but Mr. Gladstone pointed out that this provision had been deliberately adopted with a view to University Extension, and in the interests of economy among students. It was, in short, a vital feature of the Government scheme, and it need not, he thought, be attended by such consequences as Pusey feared, the admission of Dissenters or a relaxation of moral discipline. Pusey was not satisfied; it was his manner to express himself more strongly as a correspondence grew, and to one such letter, on the whole drift of the Bill, Mr. Gladstone replied in general terms, urging that his own experience had led him to find 'a tendency to over-much apprehension with respect to changes, and over-little confidence in the good sense and self-command of our contemporaries and our children coming on after them in succession, to *work* these changes.'

¹ Pusey does not appear to have anticipated one great mischief of this measure: its transfer of endowments, intended for the poor, to the sons of parents who could pay for forcing

tutors and so secure University prizes. Its effect was to make a present of the endowments of Oxford to the upper middle class.

In another letter Mr. Gladstone made a strenuous effort to allay Pusey's apprehensions by a general statement of the recommendations of the Bill as they presented themselves to his own mind.

As to the character of the particular interference contemplated, he contended that the Government had not sought in one single point to attract influence to the Crown nor strengthened the Professoriate by securing to it a fictitious majority. He calls the measure an 'emancipating Bill.'

'It emancipates the endowments of the University from restraints which have made, I should say, three-fourths of them ineffective; and it emancipates the depressed classes of the University from a state of artificial and unnatural subordination, which, after too long continuance, had at length brought about its certain but most unhappy consummation in a thorough divorce of *power* from *influence*.'

While immensely adding (as was believed) to the strength of Oxford from within by a new organization, nothing had been done to diminish the freedom of its action outwards. He believed that Oxford would exercise a far greater sway than heretofore over the mind of England. And he concludes by stating that he saw in the displeasure which this Bill excited 'that old disposition to rely on legal exclusiveness which has long been so unhappily characteristic of the Church of England, which has involved her in all her fearful difficulties, and has brought her, I sadly fear, near the day—may it yet be averted—when she shall find that she has bartered freedom for gold and gold for nothing.'

There is of course much truth in what Mr. Gladstone says, in the contention that the measure would emancipate the University from the misgovernment from which Church and University alike had suffered: but with that persistent optimism which has on other occasions disturbed his judgment, he miscalculated the real character of the forces within the University which would be brought into prominent activity by the proposed change.

When the discussion of the Bill had once opened in Parliament, Pusey could do little to influence the result; although his evidence was constantly referred to in the

debates, and especially by Lord John Russell, who made use of Pusey's learning, and disparaged his 'logic.' As the Bill made its slow way through the House of Commons, it underwent important modifications: and the tone of the writers in the *Guardian* who had hailed its appearance with alacrity became correspondingly depressed. Of these modifications, by far the most important was that by which, on a motion of Mr. Heywood, all religious tests were abolished, first at matriculation¹, and afterwards at the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Law, Medicine, or Music². The effect of this was to admit not only Nonconformists but also non-Christians to everything short of the degree which carried with it a vote in Convocation, in other words, a share in the governing body of the University. It was practically certain, from the first, that the position thus gained would be used as a reason for demanding further concessions; and that the revolution which has ended in the secularization of Oxford had indeed begun.

Mr. Gladstone had stated to Pusey that, as he apprehended, 'the Government would resist any attempt to force the admission of Dissenters on the University through the medium of the present Bill.' At the date of this letter the point had not been discussed in the Cabinet. When, on June 22, Mr. Heywood moved his first amendment, Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone both voted against it; they both supported his second amendment on June 26. Lord John Russell had, of course, all along approved of such a measure, and had only doubted whether the time had come for its adoption. Mr. Gladstone had persuaded himself that it would not be attended with any damage to the religious interests of the Church. Pusey had, some time before, anticipated the possibility of this vital change in the character of the Oxford Reform Bill: he was aware that some resident members of the University were bent on it, and that it might at any time be sprung upon Parliament by such a motion as Mr. Heywood's. When the motion

¹ On June 22, 1854.

on June 26, and carried on June 29,

² This second motion was introduced 1854.

was made, his 'impracticable' allies, the Heads of Houses, could not combine to offer effective resistance. A proposal for a petition to the House of Lords against Mr. Heywood's clause was made to the Hebdomadal Board; and the resulting situation is described in the subjoined letter.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Undated, but about end of June, 1854.]

The Heads have rejected a moderate petition framed on the basis of those in 1834, and have decided to have a petition praying for the exclusion of Dissenters from offices of teaching and government. Dr. Jeune has drawn up this in such a way, that while the University would begin by petitioning for maintaining the connexion of the University with the Church of England, its prayer is that Dissenters, &c., i.e. persons of any or no faith, should be excluded from places of teaching and government only.

So, then, if we were to support the petition, we should be asking for the admission of persons of any or no faith to be educated here and to [receive] degrees, provided they were not admitted to places of teaching and government; if we vote against it, we should formally be asking for their admission to everything.

This petition is to come before the Hebdomadal Board at 2 to-day. The Vice-Chancellor will resist it, but with what effect, God knows.

If it is carried, I shall print a letter to the Vice-Chancellor protesting against the unfairness of putting the question in such a way, that the great majority of Convocation can neither vote for nor against it, without admitting what is contrary to their convictions. I suppose that it would be better, if the Heads were to propose to us a petition, praying for the abolition of all tests and subscriptions and oaths, except the oath of allegiance, except upon offices of teaching or government. This would put the question upon a fair issue; and by defeating this, we should come to the same result.

The petition is withal meagre in the extreme.

This is the old line of the Heads, persecuting to Tractarianism, cringing to Parliament or those in power.

I am told that the majority of residents would vote against the admission of Dissenters.

I shall stay here till to-morrow, perhaps altogether, if there is a battle to be fought, or rather any last struggle.

If I can get the rejected petition in time, I will enclose it. If I have leave, I would print it, and send it to distant members of Convocation to get signed.

I have no answer from the Vice-Chancellor, so I can send nothing. Every one seems to be for giving up something; some more, some less 'Quantum mutatus ab illo' of 1834. The new generation seems wholly different from the old.

The House of Lords obeyed the House of Commons, and passed the Bill with Mr. Heywood's clauses. Lord Derby, as Chancellor of the University, led the opposition, but in a very half-hearted mood. No Bishop opposed; while the Bishop of Oxford supported the measure. Many Conservatives were not unwilling to show how liberal they could be at the expense of the Church.

When all was over in the House of Lords, Pusey poured out his soul in a letter full of pain and disappointment to Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone's reply, however unsatisfying on the question at issue, commanded Pusey's admiration by its frankness and the evident conviction which it implied that the writer had not been consciously acting against the true interests of Religion and the Church.

'You will understand, I am sure,' says Mr. Gladstone, 'why I do not weary you with acknowledgments for your extreme kindness and tenderness towards me personally: it is because such acknowledgments are better dispensed with when they must seem to the person receiving them to create a contrast between acts and professions.'

Keble was in hearty sympathy with Pusey. He put out a small but very effective pamphlet, in which he pleads that if Dissenters were to be admitted to be educated at the University, there was no reason for their being received into the Colleges. In order to escape from the evils which, in his judgment, would follow on their admission, Keble proposed the foundation of affiliated Halls at a distance from Oxford, whose members might be sent up to Oxford periodically for examination.

'No doubt,' he adds, 'this course would be academically imperfect. There might be less chance of a thriving and brilliant career. But, in cases not a few, the comparative security from proselytism, and infectious scornfulness, and a chance of growing up altogether under the shadow of the Church, would be accounted as a full compensation for all this and more¹.'

Should the threatened measure become law, through the assent of the House of Lords, Keble predicts the loss—too

¹ 'A few very plain thoughts on the proposed admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford,' p. 10.

surely since accomplished—of the old spirit which had made Oxford so dear to himself and others of his own and the next generation.

‘Neither in nor out of Oxford, when once this change has taken place, will the old Oxford feeling be possible: that indescribable mixture of something like innocent family pride, something like religious reverence, and something like a youth’s playful fondness for an indulgent mother, mixed too often with just regrets (sometimes, one may hope, not unprofitable) for opportunities thrown away; all *that* will be gone—it will not be possible—then Oxford shall no longer be able to say, as hitherto, *Dominus Illuminatio Mea*. If any Oxonians be true believers *then*, it will not be because of, but in spite of, their *Alma Mater*¹.’

The Bill of 1854 raised the whole question of the sacredness of the intentions of Founders. Mr. J. D., afterwards Lord Coleridge, had told Keble that ‘he did not care for Founders and Benefactors²,’ and this sample of rising opinion probably led Keble to express himself as follows:—

‘I am almost afraid to say anything of the intention of Founders; it seems to have become so very distasteful a topic, that any argument raised upon it, one fears, may rather damage than help a good cause. But, so far as it is at all worth considering, undoubtedly it tells against doing away with all religious tests on admission to Collegiate endowments. After all deductions made for the difference between the two Churches, no man of candour or common sense can doubt that William of Wykeham and Archbishop Chichele (to say nothing of the earlier and more liberal class of Founders, nor of those who were actual Protestants), would rather have their alumni Churchmen after the fashion of the Prayer-book, than a mixed multitude of any or no religion, without common prayers, or definite instruction³.’

Pusey had not been prepared to accept unreservedly the old doctrine about the immutability of Founders’ wills. Founders had given what they gave to the Church: and the Church might change the form of their bequest, though the State could not.

¹ ‘A few very plain thoughts on the proposed admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford,’ pp. 11, 12.

² ‘Memoir of Rev. John Keble,’ by

the Right Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge, D.C.L., p. 375.

³ ‘A few very plain thoughts on the proposed admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford,’ pp. 8, 9.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Dec. 22, 1853.


I have been asked to give evidence on the College question to the Tutors' Association, as also to impress Gladstone (if I could) with the sacredness of Founders' wills. I see that you have a decided opinion. I myself am in this difficulty. I suppose that the Church ought to have a power of regulating everything entrusted to her, and that all which Founders bequeath to the glory of God is, in fact, committed to the Church. I suppose that it is in this way that we justify the great changes at the Reformation. But then, the wrong thing would be, not that they propose to do away the restrictions to certain localities (if it is disadvantageous), but that the State, not the Church, is going to do it.

I suppose that we may ask the question, 'Would the Founders, if they could meet together and consult now, put these restrictions upon their bequests?' Would they, or would they not, think that they worked well? I suppose that they do not work so well mostly, as those which are open.

If we think honestly, that the Founders would, if they were alive now, make some changes, we, I suppose, may make them. And we may, I suppose, estimate what they would think by what good men would judge now, or by what the Church would judge. Thus, it may be, that individual Founders would be Roman Catholics still. But we have no scruples about retaining their foundations, because the Church has regulated this. And so, I suppose, it could do as to lesser things.

I do not wish you to dictate a long letter as to this. But I should like to know your mind, because I cannot see, as yet, that there is not a power somewhere of regulating or modifying Founders' wills, so that you keep the general principle, as in this case the glory of God, by training those qualified to serve Him. . . .

Pusey however was far from being prepared for the wholesale neglect of Founders' intentions on which the legislation of modern Oxford has been based.



DR. PUSEY'S LODGINGS IN CHRIST CHURCH—VIEW OF DRAWING-ROOM SIDE.

CHAPTER XVI.

COMMEMORATION, 1853—FIRST ELECTION TO HEBDOMADAL COUNCIL—UNIVERSITY BUSINESS—DEATHS OF LADY EMILY PUSEY, MR. PHILIP PUSEY, LADY LUCY PUSEY, DEAN GAISFORD, DR. MILL, CHARLES MARRIOTT.

1853-1858.

THE old Laudian Oxford came to an end in 1854.

At the Commemoration of the preceding year the University was occupied with the installation of a new Chancellor in the place of the Duke of Wellington. On this matter Pusey wrote: 'The Heads have applied to Lord Derby to be Chancellor. I should have preferred the Duke of N., but division might have been fatal and brought in Lord J. R[ussell].' On this occasion, Pusey's eldest brother was included among those who received an honorary degree of Doctor in Civil Law. Another distinguished person who was selected for decoration on this occasion was Mr. Benjamin Disraeli. There was some talk of opposing his degree on religious grounds. Keble however

expressed his opinion that unless a man's unsoundness in the faith was notorious, he had better not be opposed, and the opposition was finally dropped.

During this Commemoration week, a large party of the Pusey family came to Oxford to witness the honour done to the head of the family, and to take part in the festivities going on at that time. Pusey's letters show how he was engaged in making arrangements for the amusement of his nieces, and settling what balls and parties should be attended. His house was full, but he himself withdrew for two nights to his brother's at Pusey. Wednesday, the day preceding the scene in the Theatre, was a mournful anniversary for his sister-in-law, Lady Emily Pusey. Her diary contains the entry:—

'Wednesday, June 8th.—Melancholy day. It was the funeral of my dear brother Edward last year. . . . God's will be done. . . . Dr. Pusey gave me the communion at eight o'clock.'

The new Oxford, created by the University Reform Act, met in October, 1854. The first thing that it had to do was to elect its new Governing Body. 'I suppose,' wrote Pusey to Keble, 'that the Hebdomadal Board will be a very fair representative of the residents, whatever that may be.' He imagined that the real tug of war would begin with the discussion on the statutes for the new Halls. The new Council was to consist of six Heads of Houses, six Professors, and six Members of Congregation. At the first election, on Oct. 24, Pusey's name stood second on the list of professors; Professor R. Hussey's being first¹. Pusey's election was no doubt largely due to the interest in academical matters of which he had given proof in his evidence before the Delegacy and his reply to Professor Vaughan. But it had another meaning as well.

'The University of Oxford,' it was remarked, 'has taken advantage of the first moment after her recovery of freedom of action to remove from Dr. Pusey all trace of that cruel stigma which a small knot of

¹ The first Council consisted of Drs. Williams (New), Scott (Balliol), Hawkins (Oriental), Gaisford (Christ Church), Jeune (Pembroke), Symonds (Wadham); Professors Hussey, Pusey,

Daubeney, Cardwell, Wilson, Donkin; Members of Congregation, Messrs. Mansel, J. B. Mozley, Dr. Lightfoot, Messrs. Michell, Gordon, Marriott.

official persons, usurping her rights and name, once succeeded in temporarily fastening upon him.'

He soon justified, on grounds of academical experience and capacity for business, the choice of the electors ; and, as long as he had health to occupy it, his seat was undisputed. He filled it for more than a quarter of a century.

On taking his place in the Council, Pusey found himself sitting side by side with two of 'the Six Doctors,' with others who had been strong theological opponents, and with more than one representative of the rising academical Liberalism which was to add so much to the labours of his later life. Indeed in the Council Pusey was brought into personal contact with the leading men in the University in a manner which had for many years been impossible in consequence of his studious and secluded habits. Consequently, sides of his character hitherto unrecognized came to be appreciated. He met old friends like Mozley and Marriott, and some others, like Mr. Mansel and Mr. Osborne Gordon, whom he knew less intimately, but with whom he always cordially co-operated. But his work in the Council, as he put it, 'led by God's mercy to the healing of some wounds of former years.' It completely re-established his old and affectionate relations with the Provost of Oriel : and it led others who had known less of him to do justice to capacities for which they had not given him credit. 'I have made a discovery,' said Dr. Jeune, the Master of Pembroke, 'since I have been in Council : I always thought of Pusey as a mere theologian ; I find he is an admirable man of business.' Pusey in his turn learnt to reciprocate this feeling towards the future Bishop of Peterborough. 'Jeune,' he said, 'is not the sort of man some of our friends have thought him : he is a person of clear and strong, if somewhat narrow faith, and brings an acute and powerful mind to the support of positive truth.'

A seat in the Council, especially during the first years of its existence, made a new and formidable demand upon Pusey's overtaxed strength and time. 'Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, from 1 o'clock to 4, are occupied by

Council': so he writes to a friend in May, 1855. And this represented only a small part of the new work thus entailed on him. He worked on several committees, and had to prepare materials for their consideration: the addition to his correspondence was, of itself, considerable. But all the time was not lost to the work of his Chair and Theology generally. He always went to the meetings of Council armed with a packet of letters to be answered, or slips of proofs to be corrected; and when any subject was being discussed in which he felt no strong interest, or rather to which he could contribute nothing, he at once began to work as though he had been in his study at Christ Church. He had a remarkable faculty of concentrating himself on such work, and yet all the while keeping a vigilant outlook on what was going forward. He used often to observe that in a body like Council, a certain number of persons think it due to themselves or those who vote for them, to talk for a certain time on all questions, but that this does not of itself prove that they are able to elucidate the subject. He was able to keep an eye on the general drift of such speakers; to ascertain how they would vote on a division; and then to address himself, for the moment, to some subject which pressed closely on his head and heart. Many of his spiritual letters to Sisters of mercy and others were written in Council.

It may be asked how a man in Pusey's position could have consented to devote so much time and energy to merely academical details, to which other men who had not his more anxious burden of purely religious responsibilities weighing upon them, could have attended just as well. His object in joining the Council was to work for the retention of as much of the old religious Oxford as he could; and he felt that he could best do this by throwing himself with all his heart into any new efforts that promoted the real interests of education and discipline. He saw clearly that the admission of Dissenters into Oxford meant, sooner or later, that all posts of influence and teaching in the University would be thrown open to

them, and that Dissenters were not the only or by any means the most undesirable persons who would be thus admitted. Behind Puritan Dissent—which he considered unlikely to resist the solvents that awaited it in University society—there appeared the more threatening form of unbelief hand in hand at one time with Pantheistic philosophy, at another with crude materialism. In all the pending schemes for rearranging the teaching staff of the University, this, the religious interest, was pre-eminently, or rather almost alone, present to Pusey's mind. Although in the event he was defeated in his more immediate aims, still he fought the battle for nearly a quarter of a century, and, if he could not prevent the separation between the Church and the University, he at least helped to retard it and limit its effect, and thereby to gain time for the rearrangement of the constructive forces of religion.

Pusey had no sooner taken his seat in the Council than questions were discussed which showed the real character of the new situation. The Council had first of all to make the arrangements which were necessary for admitting Dissenters to the University as undergraduates, and Bachelors in several Faculties. The proposed statute which Pusey had supported, provided that Dissenters should not be examined in theology, but should be allowed to take up some classical author as an equivalent in quantity to the Divinity examination which was imposed on members of the Church. On the introduction of this statute into Congregation it was opposed by Dr. Macbride, who was thinking only of 'Evangelical Dissenters,' and proposed for such persons an examination in the text of the New Testament, the matter of the Old, and the evidences of religion.

Pusey replied,—

'It is impossible to examine in divinity those who did not agree with us. The Three Creeds had been proposed as a substitute for the Articles, but the Three Creeds meant differently in the mouths of different religionists. So with regard to Scripture; it was understood in a multitude of senses. Again, it was not agreed what was Scripture. Different sects had their own versions, and some included in Scripture what others rejected. He could not come to any other conclusion

than that we must refrain from examining in divinity those who did not accept our views of divine truth. He supported the proposed statute¹.

To the despairing exclamation of Dr. Macbride that 'no one seemed to care for the glory of God,' Pusey replied that the glory of God had been the object of those who framed the statute through all their deliberations.

He would not, however, have said as much as this with respect to the next discussion of a kindred character which came before the Council. The Oxford Reform Act had decided that certain new professorships were to be established by the Colleges; and Council was engaged in preparing statutes for the prescribed Chairs. Among the questions to be decided was this: what were to be the religious obligations, if any, of the professors? In the case of professors who were already members of Convocation, the question was, at that time, settled by the still-existing law: but what of the professors who would be elected from outside the University? Pusey writes to Dr. Bull:—

E. B. P. TO REV. DR. BULL.

March, 1855.

The Hebdomadal Council has decided that sundry professors are to be members of Convocation, and accordingly members of the Church of England; but that those who are not, are only to say that they will '*cultui et ritibus Ecclesiae Anglicanae conformes se praestabunt.*' I tried several resolutions, but was defeated (the Dean being in the majority), (1) that they should be members of the Church of England; (2) that they should communicate with the Church of England; (3) that they would be '*sincere et ex animo conformes.*' So the Council has declared that they are to say that they will conform, but does not require them to be sincere.

The Council has anticipated Mr. Heywood, and put us in an inconsistent position; and others will soon rectify the inconsistency, by making us consistent in the wrong direction. I believe that we have destroyed ourselves, and that Oxford is lost to the Church of England. The dam is broken. How soon it will be carried away, God only knows. I have done what I could; now there is nothing more to fight for. The principle is gone.

When the measure proposed by the Council, itself unsatisfactory enough in Pusey's judgment, was brought into Congregation, it was confronted with an amendment which

¹ *Guardian*, March 7, 1855, p. 197.

made it more unsatisfactory still. It was proposed that the professors who were not already members of Convocation should only be required to take a negative test : they would not directly or indirectly teach anything detrimental to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. Upon this Pusey pointed out what was in his judgment the absurdity of drawing a line between theological and non-theological professorships. 'All the sciences moved like planets round the sun of God's Truth ; and, if they left their course, they would be hurled back into chaos.'

Pusey was depressed—partly no doubt by other matters, domestic and theological, which pressed heavily upon him—but also and especially by the prospects which were opening before him with increasing clearness of the future of Oxford. 'We must,' he writes to Mr. Gladstone, 'have the struggle with Rationalism : but it is miserable to have it coming down upon the young from those who ought to teach them the truth. You must long for the same in this as I. Perhaps you are more hopeful.' A few days later, after Dean Gaisford's funeral, he writes in the same strain, but in view of a larger horizon. His text is Sir John Pakington's Education Bill.

E. B. P. TO RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

Christ Church, Jan. 10, 1855.

I am very sorry that you were prevented from attending the Dean's funeral. Bull had the arrangements. There was no time to call upon him, because I had my lecture to give ; and it is so difficult to understand a note. I certainly imagined from it, that there would be none but personal friends, except those actually in College ; and I looked wistfully for you, when I observed how many others came.

However, there will be an opportunity of showing respect to his memory by joining early in contributing towards a Greek Scholarship or Prize, to be called after him. The amount of the contribution need not be large ; but the early contribution shows the livelier interest. The Canons and Censors are going to meet to-morrow morning.

What a disappointment Sir J. P.'s Bill is. I have long thought that the Conservatives had the same sort of love for the Church, as the monkey had for the cat whose paw it employed. They liked the Church as long as it politically helped them. Strange that, of three Bills, Lord J. R.'s should be the least bad, although the compulsory system will, I suppose, in any case cripple the voluntary. I hope, now that the

Government seems stronger, there will be no dissolution this year, and so that your election will not come on, until our soreness about the Bill has passed away, and we take it, as the state of things which God's Providence has allotted to us. The Bishops have done and do nothing for us ; so I know not why one should expect anything from any one. There is no heart to convert those great masses in our towns. Our diseases are too deep for a cure. Our University has been losing its tone. One cannot look for anything either at home or abroad : one can but work for one's day and then die.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

The great victory of the academical Liberals in 1854-5 plunged Pusey into one of his fits of despondency. He had hoped that a private Hall, reserved for members of the Church, would be opened in Oxford under the presidency of the Rev. C. Marriott, but, on June 29, 1855, that devoted servant of God was debarred from all active work in this world by a stroke of paralysis. Keble suggested that Mr. Copeland should take Marriott's place.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church, Feb. 27, 1856.

I have done nothing about either Hall or Commentary. I have been busy about University business and my book on Councils, hoping to clear off this. Nor is there any one I can move. I did all I could to keep Copeland here. Had he stayed, perhaps he would have been Head of Trinity College. But since I could not keep him, much less could I bring him back.

The retrograde movement here is acknowledged even by such as Scott (Master of Balliol) and Lightfoot (of Exeter). Twenty years ago people's minds were earnest, directed towards theology ; now they are turned away from it. The young men (our future clergy) are ignorant, in the extreme, of the Bible. And I see not who is to rouse them to anything better. Burgon does something in Oriel, Gilbertson in Jesus, Meyrick perhaps in Trinity. But what is the wheat to the chaff? . . .

The loneliness and despondency which is suggested by this last letter was caused by events which touched Pusey even more closely than the darkest academical outlook. The years covered by this chapter and that which follows witnessed the death of some of those who were dearest to Pusey—of his eldest brother, his brother's wife, and his mother. Before these sorrows opened on him the marriage

of his surviving daughter withdrew an element of social brightness from his family life. Soon after her engagement to the Rev. J. G. Brine, Pusey writes to his son :—

‘April 13, 1854.

‘So you and I are to be alone soon, my dearest Philip. We must see what will be best to be done. It will be strange in that large house, so often so full, to be two solitary beings. However,

“Who hath the Father and the Son
May be left, but not alone.”’

A great gap was made in the already narrowed circle of the family by the death of Philip Pusey’s wife, Lady Emily. She had been in weak health for more than four years; and in October, 1854, Pusey was summoned, somewhat suddenly, to her bedside. He had felt what was coming, and had for some time taken every opportunity of being with her. The last pages of her diary show how much she leant on him, and how much she owed to him, as her life drew towards its close.

‘April 24, 1854.—Dear Dr. Pusey sat with me for some time. We talked about my state of health quite openly. It is clear that Dr. Acland thinks there is no hope but of protracting my life a little longer.

‘April 25, 1854.—Dr. Pusey and I had some more comfortable conversation.’

Then follow many other entries to the same effect. ‘His visits are always soothing.’ ‘We had much calm and pleasant conversation.’ Scarcely a week passed, throughout the summer, in which Pusey did not go over to his brother’s house to administer the Holy Communion to Lady Emily. These occasions are generally recorded with a deepening sense that each was a step towards the last.

‘July 12, 1854.—William came to take leave of me. It is probably our last parting.’

On the following day she records her niece’s marriage :—

‘July 13, 1854.—This morning Mary Pusey was married to Mr. Brine at Oxford by her father : William giving her away.’

As the weeks pass there is a monotony in the diary, which, however, is never other than cheerful.

'August 16, 1854.—Dr. Pusey read the prayers for the Visitation of the Sick to me.

'August 20, 1854.—This morning our little party assembled round my bedside at half-past seven, and dear Dr. Pusey, in his surplice, gave us the Holy Communion.

'August 22, 1854.—Dear Dr. Pusey's birthday. He read prayers to me.'

Another entry describes Dr. Pusey as sitting with her on a fine August evening 'under the oak tree on the upper terrace for an hour and a half.' It was the last occasion of her leaving the house.

'September 6, 1854.—This evening dear Dr. Pusey arrived from Oxford, and after dinner he came and sat with me for more than an hour; first reading prayers to me. It is impossible to say how great a comfort I have in him.

'September 8, 1854.—At half-past seven Dr. Pusey gave us the Holy Communion, and was obliged to return to Oxford at eight o'clock, before breakfast.'

In October Lady Emily became rapidly worse: and Pusey spent every hour that he could spare at her bedside. Early in October he writes to Keble: 'All is as happy and peaceful here as the eve of a leave-taking can be after thirty-two happy years.' On October 22, he wrote again: 'I am still lingering on here: our good Lord has still something for my dear sister here: she loses strength so gradually that no one can think when the close will be, though it does not seem far off. The autumn leaf drops at last, each at its precise time, though to us they look so alike.' Later, after describing the lingering character of the illness, he adds, 'From her I hear nothing but thankfulness.' November had begun: and Lady Emily still lingered on.

'My stay here,' writes Pusey to Keble, 'is prolonged: Emily is staying longer with us than seemed likely a little while ago. I suppose that it may even be until the close of this year. It is the gentler parting for my poor brother: he too was giving way physically, which makes me the more anxious to be [with him].'

A few days later matters had become even more critical. Pusey had increasing difficulty in being absent from Oxford. He had been elected, as has been already stated, to the

Hebdomadal Council, which was now holding its first meetings and committees.

But the end came on November 13th. Pusey was present. 'She fell asleep gently,' he wrote to his son, 'this morning at 8.30. She had been dying since 2 o'clock: but said, "Death has no pain. It is indeed swallowed up in victory." A most peaceful end of a holy blameless life.'

To Pusey the death of his sister-in-law was a great personal sorrow. Her distinction of mind and character, but especially the earnestness with which she had thrown herself into the cause which he had most deeply at heart, had made her very dear to him. No other member of his family in his own generation understood him as she did. But especially he felt that her death would probably involve at no distant time that of his eldest brother. Never was a widower more heartbroken than Mr. Pusey. He could attend to nothing: and Pusey had to make all the arrangements which must be made at such seasons. He gave all orders about the funeral; received the relatives; and was in constant attendance by night as well as by day on his elder brother, who could hardly be persuaded to allow him to go into the next room. After the funeral, Dr. Acland advised a change of air; but as Mr. Pusey would go nowhere without his brother, and Pusey could not leave Oxford, Mr. Pusey begged to be taken to Christ Church. The spacious drawing-room, and the adjoining bedroom traditionally associated with Wolsey's visits to Oxford, and distinguished by the Renaissance details of the window which looks out on St. Aldate's, were placed at his disposal. These rooms were, as has been seen, so associated with his wife, that Pusey had not entered them for years, but he soon had occasion to spend a great part of his time in them. His brother had not been more than a week at Christ Church when he was stricken by paralysis. He lingered on for nine months. Among the letters of sympathy which Pusey received at this time is one from Mr. Gladstone, showing high appreciation of his brother's worth and character.

Early in January there seems to have been a rally.

‘I have shoved off everything,’ writes Pusey to Keble, ‘which admitted of delay, day by day and week by week. The shores of Italy continually recede. I have been hoping and hoping to get to Hursley. My poor brother is, in some degree, better, although half paralyzed, and the paralyzed side does not recover. Still he has been recovered, thus far, from the very gates of death; so we may hope, I know not what; but that he may be continued for some time longer to his children.’

So the spring of 1855 passed: in June there was a second stroke, which announced the nearer approach of death. ‘My poor brother,’ wrote Pusey, ‘has had another, if not two attacks of the same sort [as before]; so that now it can only be a question of time. It may be months yet.’

It was, however, to be sooner than Pusey thought. His brother died on July 9, 1855.

The last scene is described by Pusey in letters to Keble and Mr. Gladstone. In both he dwells upon the last ‘look.’ He often used to say that the soul speaks through the eye, and that it speaks sometimes most clearly thus when there is no longer strength to speak with the mouth. ‘That look,’ he wrote to Mr. Gladstone, ‘will live with me while I live.’

Pusey and his brother had been closely connected together since their infancy: and the loss was, as he said, ‘beyond human words.’ In consequence of their father’s death, his nieces came to him at Christ Church; and for a time the ordinary society of a family was resumed at Pusey’s lodgings.

‘As time went on, and the mourning for my father was over,’ writes Mrs. Fletcher, ‘my uncle became very anxious to make it a cheerful place, and encouraged us to give little parties in the drawing-room, at which Mrs. Liddell or some other lady presided. Sometimes we had music and choruses, &c., which delighted my uncle; and he would say next day, “You were very lively last night: I could hear the voices.” Nothing ever disturbed him or came amiss.’

It was a great sorrow to Pusey when in December, 1855, six months after his brother’s death, his nephew, Mr. Sidney Bouverie Pusey, who was at the time fifteen years old, was removed from his care by the guardians who were appointed under the terms of Mr. Philip Pusey’s will. That

Mr. Pusey had not appointed either of his own brothers, Edward and William, to be the guardians of his son, was due doubtless to the anti-clerical feeling which he had to a certain extent imbibed ten years before; the arrangement certainly does not represent his thoughts at the close of his life towards a brother under whose roof he came to die. But while feelings change, the letter of a will lasts and is inexorable; and the guardians may have felt that the intention which led to their appointment made it a duty to remove young Mr. Pusey from his uncle's care. Pusey protested, but to no purpose.

'I have entered the strongest protest I could against their taking him away from me,' writes Pusey to the Rev. R. F. Wilson, 'and have told them that I would give no opinion as to any plan they may have for him. . . . It will be a breach between the guardians and me, if they do it. I do not mean of charity, which one must keep, but of everything else.' Keble sympathized warmly with Pusey in this trouble. To one of the guardians who had observed that it was very natural in Mr. Pusey to distrust clerical influences, he observed that it was 'unfortunate for him or for any one to neglect the opportunities for keeping young people in the right way which our Saviour, by His Providence, had placed within their reach.'

Pusey's nieces however often came to stay with him. 'From the moment' of our father's death 'and ever since,' writes one of them, 'he was a father to us, and such a father as falls to the lot of few.'

But another and even a greater sorrow than his brother's death was about to fall on Pusey.

Until 1858, Lady Lucy Pusey had preserved, together with fair average health, the quiet, humble, cheerful, hopeful temper, which made her what she was to her children and to those who knew her. In the spring of 1858 there were signs that her health was giving way. She lost something of her wonted spirits; found attendance at South Audley Chapel twice on a Sunday a greater fatigue than she could bear; and showed other signs of declining

strength. True to her character, she still never allowed herself to lie down during the day, or even to lean back in a chair ; and, at night, she would not allow a servant to sleep even on the same floor as her own bedroom.

On the fourth Sunday in Lent she received the Holy Communion for the last time at Grosvenor Chapel ; Dr. Pusey kneeling at her side. He had returned to Oxford ; when, on the day before Palm Sunday, he was summoned by telegraph to London. Her son's presence roused her for the time ; she exclaimed with animation, ' Dear, dear Edward ' ; she told him that she was quite well, and begged him to ' go to your books.' She apologized for the trouble she was giving : and her last hours were throughout marked by the simple forgetfulness of self which had characterized her whole life. As she could not swallow, it was impossible to administer the Blessed Sacrament to her.

' I said,' wrote Pusey to his brother William on Good Friday, 1858, ' some short prayers by her, and repeated texts which were prayers, and she thanked me. A little while before she ceased to breathe, she said, " Now I wish to be quite quiet, that there should be none but you [I] and Dr. Cotton." I saw her hands put together in prayer, and then I was silent, because she would best know how to pray. I told her she was going to God, when I saw that she was dying. She answered, in that humility which you know as the characteristic of her life, that she was not fit. I answered you will suppose how.'

When all was over Pusey wrote to Keble : ' She died in that deep humility which had been the characteristic of her whole life, feeling herself unworthy to enter into His Presence.' It was with reference to his mother that Pusey wrote twenty-two years afterwards :—

" I am not prepared," was the exclamation of a pious, simple, and humble soul, who had served God and trusted in Jesus beyond the ordinary period of mortality, when told that she was shortly to see God. For the thought of His awful Holiness and the inadequacy of our best love stood out before her. To such a soul it would have been an unspeakable comfort to have known, that although she was not yet prepared for the sight of His All-Holiness, there was a waiting time, out of the reach of sin, in which she might be prepared for the Presence of Him Who had ever been her God¹.

¹ ' What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?' pp. 122, 123. Parker, Oxford.

The end came at half-past two o'clock on the afternoon of Palm Sunday. Pusey wrote to his brother William, who was staying in Madeira for the sake of an invalid son :—

“It is the Lord, let Him do as seemeth Him good.” He has given us our dearest mother for a time far beyond the age of man at his full strength, and she has been waiting so long at the gate of Paradise, always looking that she would not remain long with us. She has remained so much longer than we hoped, and now, in His mercy, she has entered into her rest, and her works do follow her.’

Pusey often used to say that a mother’s death makes the world a different world to all of us. He was speaking from his own experience. She had been more to him than most mothers are to the best of sons ; and no mother, she used to say, could have had a better son than God had given her.

A year later, Pusey wrote to his brother William thus when his youngest son had passed away :—

‘It is indeed a change to have no mother here, and that London should be a great solitude to one. Yet it was a long time for which she was given to us. Your object in going to Madeira was beautifully fulfilled by our good Father, and now they await us and pray for our perfecting and our coming. What a day of meeting!’

But Lady Lucy’s death affected Pusey in other ways. From that date, Pusey practically took leave of the two homes of his childhood. The house in Grosvenor Square soon passed into other hands. Pusey House was partly shut up during the minority of Dr. Pusey’s nephew : and he only visited the place on two occasions after that on which he stood by his mother’s grave on the Easter Eve of 1858¹. He shrank from visiting scenes, houses, and rooms which were associated with those whom he had loved in past years : he used to call them, generally, ‘cities of the dead.’ He dreaded the dissipation of energy which is sometimes caused by the reanimation of old sorrows : life, he would say, is too short to be spent on anything but the work which God has given us to do.

During the period referred to, the visits of death were

¹ In both instances, at his nephew’s wish, Dr. Pusey went to Pusey in order to meet Bishop Wilberforce.

not confined to Pusey's family circle. At its beginning he lost Dr. W. H. Mill ; at its close, the Rev. C. Marriott.

Pusey used to say that Mill was the greatest divine that Cambridge had produced in the present century, probably since Pearson. As a very distinguished mathematician, an Oriental scholar of unusual accomplishments, and the master of a vigorous and dignified style, Mill would in any case have commanded the attention of the learned world. But he also possessed that distinctly theological habit of mind without which knowledge and capacity are not easily turned to account for the highest purposes ; and—not to speak of his Sanscrit poem—he is probably seen at his best in his sermons on the Temptation, and in his powerful refutation of Strauss's application of the Pantheistic philosophy to the interpretation of the Gospels¹. No other Cambridge man of equal eminence had devoted himself with such generous self-forgetful labour to the revival of Catholic truths in the Church of England ; and when in 1848, the distinguished Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta, and the trusted Chaplain of Archbishop Howley, became Hebrew Professor at Cambridge, Pusey had scarcely set any bounds to his confident expectations that the sister University would take the lead in the promotion of 'true religion and useful learning,' as that phrase was understood by Churchmen. But Mill only held his chair for a short five years ; his health was already undermined by his life of unremitting toil ; and after a very short illness, he died at Brasted on Christmas Day, 1853.

'This,' wrote Pusey to the Rev. B. Webb, 'is indeed a very heavy blow, a blow to us all, the very heaviest to me next to dear J. K. I loved Dr. Mill extremely, little as our intercourse had been. . . . I was thankful to hear of that peaceful close ; how could it be otherwise ? But to us the loss is irreparable. God have mercy upon us.'

A month before his brother's death, on June 2, 1855, another death had occurred within the walls of Christ Church which Pusey felt deeply. Dean Gaisford had been no friend to the Church Movement in Oxford ; his most

¹ 'Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels.' Cambr. 1861.

careful thought was given to other matters, and even when dealing with ecclesiastical subjects his line of study was historical rather than theological. It was thought that in his administration of Christ Church he had inclined unduly against those with whose belief he did not sympathize. However this may have been, Pusey, himself a scholar, knew how to honour in Gaisford one of the great living English masters of the Greek language and literature; and on one occasion, when a story was repeated to him about the opposition of some younger men to Gaisford's judgment, he exclaimed, for him very impatiently, 'There is more scholarship in Gaisford's little finger than in all their heads put together.' Besides this, although Gaisford's Conservatism in religious matters had operated as a force unfriendly to that fuller theological faith which is, in the long run, and in the best sense of the word, the truest Conservatism, Pusey recognized the sterling character of Gaisford's motives, even when opposing that which he had himself most deeply at heart. 'He thinks that he is opposing novelties; and this in religion is a very good thing. The only question is, what are really novelties and what not.' 'The Dean's loss,' wrote Pusey to Keble, 'will make a great change in many ways, and not for good.'

In the same summer, a month later, he was deprived of the help and counsel of a friend, Charles Marriott, upon whose co-operation he depended more than on that of any other Oxford resident. On June 29, 1855, Marriott, on his return from a Commemoration at St. Peter's College, Radley, of which he was one of the original 'Fellows,' was struck by paralysis, and although he lingered three years, his work was done. Since his return to Oxford in 1841, on his resignation of the Principalship of Chichester Theological College, and especially after Newman's withdrawal in 1843, Marriott had become Pusey's most intimate and trusted ally; in the language of Oxford at the time, he 'succeeded to the vacant place in the Triumvirate'¹.

¹ This appears in the frequent association of the initials in devotional and other works.

The twelve years of this close relationship comprised the most anxious period of Pusey's life; and, next to Keble, Marriott contributed more than any other friend in the way of sympathy and counsel to enable him to sustain the burden of his position. But of their constant intercourse there is little record, owing to their living so close to one another at Christ Church and Oriel, and the little necessity in consequence of any written correspondence. The few letters that remain, written principally during vacations, are concerned with the details of literary work in which the friends had a common interest; more particularly they deal with the successive volumes of the *Library of the Fathers*, to which Marriott was so great and efficient¹ a contributor. Regret has sometimes been expressed that so fine a mind as his should have been so largely spent in the 'immense quantity of hack-work'² which was necessary in order to carry out this laborious enterprise; and that Marriott should have devoted to the correction of proofs and the construction of indexes time which might have been given to some Biblical Commentary or other original work. Such work, however, was an inevitable, although sad necessity, if the *Library of the Fathers* was to be edited at all, and there is no real doubt Pusey shared with his friend the drudgery of the undertaking. It is true, nevertheless, that in the language of self-depreciation and affectionate hyperbole, Pusey sometimes assigns to Marriott the whole merit of editing the *Library of the Fathers*³.

¹ Marriott appears to have edited the texts of nearly half the *Library of forty-eight volumes*; but his independent contributions to it of prefaces and notes were much less considerable than Pusey's.

² Burgon's '*Lives of Twelve Good Men*,' i. 321.

³ In Burgon's '*Lives, &c.*' i. 321, it is stated that Keble 'contributed to the *Library of the Fathers* nothing but the sanction of his name'; and that, for at least fourteen years, 'every most irksome and inglorious department of editorial responsibility was freely imposed

upon Marriott singly.' The accuracy of the first statement may be measured by the fact that perhaps the best of the translations, that of St. Irenaeus, is the work of Mr. Keble; while he edited St. Chrysostom's *Homilies on 1 Cor.*, besides contributing his assistance in difficulties throughout the work. The present writer's own recollections of Pusey's work and study enable him to contradict the second assertion: nothing could be less true than that the mechanical work of editorship was imposed on Marriott *alone*.



Walker & Boutall Ph.

Monro D.



What a high estimate Pusey had formed of his friend's work is evident from the subjoined passage :—

‘Full of activity in the cause of truth and religious knowledge, full of practical benevolence, expending himself, his strength, his paternal inheritance, in works of piety and charity, in one night his [Marriott's] labour was closed, and he was removed from active duty to wait in stillness for his Lord's last call. His friends may perhaps rather thankfully wonder, that God allowed one, threatened in many ways with severe disease, to labour for Him so long and so variously, than think it strange that He suddenly, and for them prematurely, allowed him thus far to enter into his rest. To those who knew him best, it has been a marvel how, with health so frail, he was enabled in such various ways, and for so many years, to do active good in his generation. Early called, and ever obeying the call, he has been allowed both active duty and an early rest ¹’

Marriott lived on, though an invalid, with his brother, the Rev. John Marriott, Curate of Bradfield, Berks, and passed away on Sept. 15, 1858. Pusey was in Cornwall, and too remote to travel up for the funeral.

At the end of that year Keble wrote to Pusey :—

‘What a season this has been for the departure of old friends ! John Miller, Ellison, C. Marriott, W. Barter, and, as I have just heard, Frank Dyson. The tide seems fast encroaching on one's island ; pray, dear friend, that one may be ready.’

¹ Preface, vol. vi. p. iii. (Oxf. transl.) of St. Augustine's Expositions of the Psalms.

CHAPTER XVII.

SECOND PERIOD OF EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY—SERMON ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST—CASE OF ARCHDEACON DENISON—CHARGE OF THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN.

1853—1860.

‘Still is the might of truth, as it hath been :
Lodged in the few, obeyed, and yet unseen.
Reared on lone heights and rare,
His Saints their watch-flame bear,
And the mad world sees the wide-circling blaze,
Vain-searching whence it streams, and how to quench its rays.’
Lyra Apostolica, lxxxv.

PUSEY had preached several times before the University since the termination of the period for which he had been suspended. Of these sermons three had been published, two on the ‘Entire Absolution of the Penitent’¹ and one on the ‘Rule of Faith.’ This last sermon, preached in 1851, was intended at once to define the true position of the Church of England with regard to the Faith, against Puritanism on the one hand and the Church of Rome on the other, and also to shew the nature of the authority to which she appeals on such subjects as the Eucharistic Presence. It was neither Scripture interpreted by the individual, nor tradition, nor a philosophy independent of Scripture, but Scripture interpreted by the consent of the Fathers, which was the real rule of Catholic and Christian Faith ; and a recognition of this principle would make what Pusey had to say on other subjects intelligible, if not convincing.

He was now called upon to preach again ; as usual he began to think about the object, plan, and details of his sermon some months before. He wished to apply the

¹ Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany, 1846, and First Sunday in Advent, 1846.

general principles of his sermon on the Rule of Faith to the Doctrine of the Eucharist as held by the Church of England.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Asherne, Oct. 16, 1852.

I want your thoughts on another subject. I am to preach, please God, before the University on Jan. 16. My last two sermons have been on the Roman subject, 'The Rule of Faith' and 'The Unity of the Church.' I had thought of preaching on the Unity of the Faith (which I touched upon in the sermon on the Rule of Faith) as a sort of Irenicon, following Le Blanc, Cassander, and the like, as showing approximations of doctrine where there seemed to be difference, real agreement in differing words.

I have since thought whether there may not be reasons rather for taking one doctrine, the Holy Eucharist, with a practical application to young men, not to profane It, when it is part of the College system to receive It. I preached before 'The Holy Eucharist a comfort to the penitent.' This would be on danger to the impenitent. This would give it a practical character.

The reasons are (1) the Bishop of Oxford has asked me to explain myself (my Letter which I began has stuck): (2) I am still under a slur, for my former condemnation, among a large party; while the University is committed to condemnation of these doctrines in the eyes of others: (3) I suspect that Roman doctrine is increasing on the one side, while there is a vague fear of any definite doctrine among others. R. W.¹ is writing what I think is quite untenable; that the Roman Church by 'Transubstantiation' does not mean a physical change; which I believe to be contrary to fact². He treats also the belief of any change in the physical substance of the elements as something very rare; from which people would infer that our Article was very superfluous, and founded on a disbelief in the Real Presence, i. e. that the compilers laid hold of an unreal thing to oppose, from not believing the truth themselves.

I had some correspondence and talks with R. W. I suspect we each remained of the same mind.

My line would be, as in my Letter and my sermon, to inculcate the doctrine of the Real Presence and to speak of the elements as remaining; as the obvious teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers.

¹ Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce. His work on 'The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist' appeared just before Whitsuntide in 1853.

² In the 'Eirenicon' (published in 1865), Part I, p. 229, Pusey may appear to contradict this. 'My own conviction is that our Articles deny Transubstantiation in one sense, and that the

Roman Church, according to the explanation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, affirms it in another.' In the 'Eirenicon' he held that the popular teaching of the Roman Schools (ib. p. 208) to which the Articles were opposed did teach a physical change (ib. p. 24).

The words at the end of the first book of Homilies 'under the form of bread and wine' furnish a good formula for the truth. Durandus says, 'It is easier to believe that the Body and Blood of Christ are present under accidents whose substance remains [which I suppose to be the English doctrine] than under accidents whose substance is gone.' This mode of statement avoids the charge of Consubstantiation. . . . If they [i. e. my former judges] pass it, they own that they were wrong before, in not giving me a hearing, whereby I might have cleared whatever in my sermon seemed to them unsound. If they condemned me again, they would take a more effectual measure than a two years' suspension. So I am told. My brother-in-law (a Low Churchman), Cotton, will be the V. C.

Will you, after a little time, tell me what you think? There is no hurry. But I must write the sermon next term in Oxford, where I have books.

Your very affectionate and grateful

E. B. P.

Keble cautiously suggested that the sermon might raise more questions than it settled: more especially he deprecated any merely theoretical discussion of so sacred a subject. By the end of the October term, however, Pusey had 'written little fragments of' his sermon, that Keble might judge whether 'it would do.'

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Christ Church, Dec., 1852.]

If what is preached is undisputed a good deal will have been gained. People will no more be able to say that the doctrine is condemned. Those at Oxford are a good deal more accustomed to the doctrine than they were. When it was preached, too, we were a strong, concentrated, aggressive body. And they had settled to put down some one. Now, truth is more widely spread; but we are weak and broken and forsaken by so many; and I do not think they wish to attack us.

Another question is, whether the sermon itself would be a good one to preach? The form of it would be to set forth to young men the greatness of the mystery, that they may be more careful to live as they should, to whom such gifts are vouchsafed.

I should be quite ready, of course, to take another subject (as Justification, in order to show that there is not that discordance as to the doctrine which people think), if you judge best.

Your very affectionate and grateful

E. B. P.

The Christmas vacation of 1852-3 was mainly spent in preparing the sermon: and it was preached on the first

Sunday in term in the midst of the excitement of an University election. It differed from the earlier sermon on the Eucharist, as a careful statement of doctrine might differ from a devotional appeal. The doctrine enunciated was the same in both sermons; but the first was the language of unguarded fervour, the second that of precise definition on this side and on that. Thus the second sermon differs from the first in the distinctness with which it insists not only on the Reality of the Sacramental Presence resulting from consecration, but also it deals with the continued existence of the substance in those consecrated elements, which are the veils of our Lord's presence. This latter side of truth was as much present to Pusey's mind when he preached his first sermon as the fact of the Objective Presence itself: but he had then supposed, that unfriendly critics would take this for granted, and he now put it forward as an explanation of his earlier language which, had opportunity been allowed, he should have given ten years before. The sermon abounds in passages of great beauty; it is penetrated through and through with Pusey's intense reality, and it closes with an appeal to the junior portion of his audience, based on the obligations of the sacramental life in Christ, which few who heard it can ever forget.

Pusey could not, however, be sure that he would not be attacked again. Certainly, the discredit attaching to the proceedings of 1843, and the sense of insecurity which the appointment of a Commission had brought with it to all who filled places of authority in Oxford, might make them hesitate. On the other hand, Pusey's teaching was in substance the same, and there was no change in the minds of those who had previously condemned him. On the day after the sermon Pusey wrote to Keble:—

[Christ Church], Mo. morning, [Jan. 17, 1853.]

'No bad report as yet about my sermon. So I hope all good. Harington, Principal of B.N.C., said, "They cannot attack him this time. He has guarded himself too well." So I hope that there is a real gain, through God's mercy. Dr. Faussett was in Oxford, and the Provost of O. heard the sermon. If they are peaceful, may I not

look upon it as a retraction of their former attack ; so that whatever their private belief may be, they are not public impugnors of the truth ?'

Pusey daily expected 'the first drops of the storm.' But a month passed, and the sermon had not been sent for.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Feb. 9, 1853.]

It is a great mercy, I trust, that the sermon has passed off thus quietly. Certainly it has passed off, thanks to your help and suggestions. For my Preface might have provoked them. The Provost of Oriel and I believe Dr. Faussett were present : the other five not.

Pusey delayed his publication of the sermon for some weeks in the hope of being able to write an appendix which would exhibit the teaching of the Fathers in its completeness. But for the present he had to content himself with adding to the text a series of notes which showed what might be coming at a later time. After Easter all his spare time was taken up with reading and preparation of evidence for the Delegacy of the Hebdomadal Board, on subjects raised by the University Commission.

But shortly afterwards the question of the Holy Eucharist was brought before the mind of the Church by two Archdeacons,—each of them men whose character and accomplishments would have given prominence to any question they might take up.

Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce was, as has been stated, received into the Roman Catholic Church in October, 1854 ; and he has told the world that this step was determined by his acceptance of the Roman doctrine of Papal Supremacy¹. But his work on the Holy Eucharist had attracted much more attention than was given to that on the 'Principles of Church Authority,' which stated at length the motives for his secession. The former treatise was in truth a much more considerable and original effort ; and its author had maintained, and maintained to the last, that it was not inconsistent—as was avowedly his later work—with the formularies of the Church of England. A report was circulated

¹ 'Principles of Church Authority,' p. 284. See also Preface, p. v.

to the effect that legal proceedings would be taken against its author in the Court of the Archbishop of York. On the Archdeacon's resignation of his preferments, which was completed before he knew that a trial was in contemplation, the proceedings were stopped by the Archbishop's orders; but the book as a whole was thus left under the shadow of hypothetical or implied condemnation, from which Pusey was anxious to rescue the greater portion of it,—all, in fact, which asserted the doctrine of the Real Presence within the true lines of Catholic antiquity,—although it contained some matter which did not command his assent.

The question was raised in another form by the action of another Archdeacon, of whose loyalty to the Church of England there has never been room for question.

Archdeacon Denison had found it necessary as Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells to reject certain candidates for ordination who did not accept the full teaching of the Church on the subject of Holy Baptism. This was not forgiven by the 'Evangelical Alliance'; but that body, with other opponents of the Archdeacon, had to bide their time. In days when the very air seemed charged with controversy they had not long to wait. In the autumn of 1853 and the following spring¹, the Archdeacon preached three sermons on the Holy Communion in Wells Cathedral. After the first two of these sermons a formal complaint was made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in February, 1854, by the Rev. J. Ditcher, the Low Church Vicar of South Brent, which adjoined the Archdeacon's parish. The Archbishop referred Mr. Ditcher to Dr. Bagot the Bishop of Bath and Wells; and the Bishop in a letter, dated April 16, 1854, gave his judgment, somewhat informally, on a doctrinal statement which the Archdeacon had submitted to him. Of that judgment the effect was practically an acquittal. The Bishop indeed censured 'speculations on the conditions of the Supernatural Presence' in the Eucharist, and also

¹ The exact dates are Aug. 7 and Nov. 6, 1853, and May 14, 1854.

any attempt on the part of the Archdeacon to require assent to his private opinions as 'the condition of holding faithfully the doctrine of the Real Presence itself.' But he did not deem it necessary to seek an authoritative decision in the Ecclesiastical Courts. Bishop Bagot died within a month of writing this letter¹, and his successor, Lord Auckland, was no sooner consecrated than Mr. Ditcher made a second application that legal proceedings might be instituted against the Archdeacon. Lord Auckland replied that a public prosecution on such a point was inadvisable; and that the matter was a *res judicata*, having been settled by his predecessor. But Mr. Ditcher was not to be baffled. It was discovered that, as patron of the living of East Brent, the Bishop of Bath and Wells could not decide the question at all; and the question whether proceedings should be instituted was therefore referred to Archbishop Sumner.

On Sept. 5, 1854, the Archbishop wrote to the Archdeacon stating that it was his painful duty to inform him that, after the expiration of fourteen days, a commission of five clergy would be appointed to inquire into a charge of false doctrine that had been brought against him, and report whether there was a *prima facie* case to be submitted to the Court of Arches. The Archdeacon hereupon applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a rule to stay proceedings on the ground that the Bishop of the diocese had already decided the matter. The Court refused the rule; and the matter had to follow its course. In truth the prosecution appeared to be part of a general plan for getting rid of advanced High Churchmen, both in the Southern and the Northern Province². So at any rate Pusey thought. He wrote to Keble:—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Oct. 1, 1854.]

This had been my continually oppressing fear for the last year. However much Denison may have provoked it, the Low Church,

¹ On Monday, May 15, 1854.

² The date of Abp. Sumner's letter to Archd. Denison, Sept. 5, 1854, significantly coincides with that of the letter of the Abp. of York to Archd.

Wilberforce, announcing the discontinuance of an inquiry with a view to proceedings, Sept. 6, 1854. Cf. 'Principles of Church Authority,' Pref. ix.

I fear, mean a war of extermination against us. Every fresh attack hems us in, and increases our difficulties, and mows down those whom we can ill spare. There must have been something amiss that we have thus had blow upon blow. Could you make a short prayer to be used daily?

Keble replied:—

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Bisley, Oct. 2, 1854.

DEAREST PUSEY,

I have not St. Gregory's Sacramentary here, which I always turn to, when asked to suggest a form of prayer. If I had, I dare say I could do better: as it is, I just send what has come into my head; the hint taken, as you will see, from yours from St. Ambrose. I hope some one will greatly improve on it. . . . Indeed, one knows too well that there has been a great deal very much amiss in many of those who have been moving in this 'Movement,' and I suppose it is but too likely that many of the troubles are due to such unworthiness: but that does not affect the cause, does it? If there is a subscription, as I suppose there must be, to support G. A. D., I shall wish to put down my name.

Your very loving

J. K.

The Archdeacon was at first charged with teaching that 'the act of Consecration causes the Bread and Wine, though remaining in their natural substances, to have the Body and Blood of Christ really though spiritually joined to them, so that to receive the one is to receive the other,' and that 'the wicked and unbelieving eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, just as much as the faithful.'

Pusey was anxious to allay the rising excitement, and with this view wrote a public letter, in which he endeavoured to show that the theological importance of the question thus raised was not so great as was generally supposed¹.

But immediately after the appearance of this letter, Mr. Ditcher made a second application to the Archbishop, who thereupon transmitted to the Archdeacon a more elaborate statement of the charges made against him. He was accused of teaching,

¹ *Guardian*, Oct. 18, 1854, p. 800.

‘That the Body and Blood of Christ being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord’s Table’—‘that to all who come to the Lord’s Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given, and that by all who come to the Lord’s Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received’—‘that the universal reception of the inward part or thing signified of the Sacrament in and by the outward sign, is a part of the doctrine of the Real Presence itself’—‘that worship is due to the real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine’—‘that the act of Consecration makes the Bread and Wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, to be Christ’s Body and Blood’—‘that in the Lord’s Supper the outward parts or signs and the inward parts or things signified are so joined together by the act of Consecration, that to receive the one is to receive the other’—‘that all who receive the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper receive the Body and Blood of Christ.’

Keble recognized the serious issues of the controversy; and wrote a public letter which at once commanded the attention of the Church. He did not, indeed, think that it was necessary to defend all the propositions attributed to the Archdeacon in order to be true to the doctrine of the Real Presence. In particular he pointed out an ambiguity attaching to the word ‘receive’ as applied to wicked communicants. In one sense it expressed what all must allow who believe at all in a Real Objective Presence. In another sense it would affirm what many such believers would account erroneous. But Keble observed that, without committing himself to every expression of the Archdeacon, the pending charges on the three most important propositions involved the whole doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. He was sorrowfully convinced that if the propositions attributed to the Archdeacon were ‘declared untenable in the Church of England, a far more serious question would arise concerning the reality of our communion with the Universal Church than had ever yet arisen¹.’

¹ Letter in *Guardian*, Nov. 22, 1854, p. 898.

In writing thus, Keble was not less moved by personal regard for the Archdeacon, than by a sense of the theological importance of the question. It was, however, difficult to help directly except under conditions which appeared to both Keble and Pusey unadvisable. There was for the moment no more to be done in this: therefore, so as to be ready for all emergencies, Pusey set himself to the work of preparing the 'Notes' to his University sermon on the Holy Eucharist, which had been so long delayed.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Christ Church, Jan. 26, 1855.

I have been working very hard with Notes on my Sermon on the H. Eucharist, in hopes that, in the event of a trial, it may the rather hinder, by God's mercy, any wrong decision as to the Real Presence. But then, it was necessary to clear the passages, alleged in support of Transubstantiation, both that our own people may not be perplexed and because people want to be assured that they are not to be taught, either Transubstantiation or (what never was taught) Consubstantiation, and it is so hard to be accurate.

As usual, he laid his friends under contribution. As in the Paradise for the Christian Soul, Mr. Copeland was the poet on whom he relied for rendering the old Latin hymns into English.

The book cost Pusey a great effort, especially at a time when his brother was lying at his house in what proved to be his last illness. 'Last term,' he wrote to a friend after Easter, 'I was working at my book on the Holy Eucharist, mostly till one a.m., and at every spare moment.' By the beginning of May the work was published and in circulation.

This remarkable book of 722 pages came before the world as 'Notes' on a single sermon. This form was adopted from Pusey's sense of a duty to support by adequate authority the most deliberate doctrinal utterance he ever made on the subject of the Holy Eucharist in the University pulpit. But it also relieved him from some of the literary obligations which would have been entailed on him by the composition of a more formal treatise; while

he was able to exhibit in ordered sequence the whole line of authorities which such a treatise would have contained. He first removed out of the way the objection made by Calvinists and Zwinglians on the one side, and by Roman Catholics on the other, that to hold the reality of the natural substance of the Elements after their consecration together with the Real Objective Presence as taught by Our Lord, could be rightly characterized as Consubstantiation; then he proceeds to show that Our Lord's language, "This is My Body," cannot be understood figuratively, while on the other hand His allusion to one consecrated Element as "the fruit of the vine" proves the survival of its natural substance. The Fathers are then quoted to illustrate each side of the truth thus presented. Pusey shows that they speak most exactly of the survival of the substance of the Elements, when they are engaged in controversies with heretics; and perhaps the most instructive of the many instructive notes in this volume is that in which he elucidates the real force of words, employed especially by Eastern Fathers, and inaccurately supposed by Roman writers to sanction the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The closing note is a massive accumulation of witnesses to the positive side of the doctrine as held by the ancient Church, namely, that after Consecration, Our Lord is Objectively Present in the Holy Eucharist. At the conclusion of upwards of five hundred pages devoted to the establishment of this point, Pusey breaks out into sentences of exultant eloquence which he permitted himself on comparatively rare occasions:—

Yes! along the whole course of time, throughout the whole circuit of the Christian world, from East and West, from North and South, there floated up to Christ our Lord one harmony of praise. Unbroken as yet, lived on the miracle of the Day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit from on high swept over the discordant strings of human tongues and thoughts, of hearts and creeds, and blended all their varying notes into one holy unison of truth. From Syria and Palestine and Armenia; from Asia Minor and Greece; from Thrace and Italy; from Gaul and Spain; from Africa Proper, and Egypt, and Arabia, and the Isles of the Sea; wherever any Apostle had taught, wherever any Martyr had sealed with his blood the testimony of Jesus; from the polished cities,

or the Anchorites of the desert, one Eucharistic voice ascended ; ' Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and all Thy words are truth.' Thou hast said, ' This is My Body,' ' This is My Blood.' Hast Thou said, and shalt not Thou do it ? As Thou hast said, so we believe.

Truly, O Lord, ' Thy holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee¹.'

The book came out in May, 1855. It was welcomed by friends whom Pusey most valued. Sir John Coleridge thought that the question of authority in respect of the doctrine of the Eucharist would be settled by Pusey's work. Archdeacon Churton was of opinion that, while the arrangement of the work might have been better, Pusey had gathered such a mass of authorities as wellnigh to exhaust the subject, and had cemented them together with such arguments as to leave nothing out of consideration. Bishop Phillpotts described the book as containing a well-timed and triumphant statement of the doctrine of the Church. There were, of course, estimates enough of a different character ; but they might have been discounted beforehand.

Meanwhile the commission appointed to report upon the alleged heterodoxy of Archdeacon Denison's sermon had sat at Clevedon. The conclusion of its proceedings had been foreseen. It reported to the effect that there was a *primâ facie* case against the Archdeacon.

' What do you think,' wrote Keble to Pusey, on Jan. 18, 1855, ' of the Denison case so far? It seems to me that they (I mean the Archbishop, etc.) are so mismanaging it, that they will almost make Denison popular in spite of himself. But surely some of our friends are putting themselves in a wrong position, in maintaining so earnestly reception by the Wicked as an integral part of the doctrine. I am afraid of the consequences when they find they have less sympathy than they had imagined. For myself, I must confess that if I were forced to decide I think there is more to be said against that tenet than for it, especially looking to St. Aug., and *most* especially to Tractate 26 on St. John, and to the passage in Ep. 98. § (I think) 17, in which he speaks of calling Sacraments by the names of the things of which they are Sacraments. But surely our Church permits us to leave it open, and surely she is right in so doing, and we are wrong to close it either way. I write all this that you may kindly point out, when convenient, any thing amiss in it.'

¹ ' Real Presence in the Fathers,' pp. 721, 722.

After the report of the Clevedon Commission, Lord Auckland was again asked, as Bishop of the Diocese, to send the case to the Court of Arches. On his refusal to do so, the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose hand was forced by decisions obtained in the Queen's Bench, reluctantly proceeded, as obliged by the Church Discipline Act, to constitute a Court to hear the case. This consisted of the Archbishop with assessors, the Rev. Dr. Heurtley, the Very Rev. G. S. Johnson, Dean of Wells, and Dr. Lushington. It met in the Guildhall at Bath on July 22, 1855, and on August 12. the Archbishop made, through Dr. Lushington, a declaration to the effect that the passages in the Archdeacon's sermons alleged by the prosecution were contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. It thus condemned, as contrary to the Articles, the doctrine that the Body and Blood of Christ are given to and received by unworthy communicants, as well as the assertion that worship is due to the Real though Invisible and Supernatural Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Archdeacon was allowed until the first day of October to revoke his adhesion to the condemned positions.

This Judgment was a great shock to all Churchmen who believed that the Church of England rejected no portion of the Sacramental teaching of the ancient Church. It distressed Keble and Pusey equally, but in different ways. Keble felt the condemnation of Eucharistic Adoration most strongly, Pusey thought the denial of the reception by the wicked was at least equally important.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

35 Grosvenor Square, Friday, [Aug. 15, 1856].

The news of this judgment reached me at the D. Duchess of Argyll's only yesterday morning. I am here with my good old Mother till Tuesday evening. Richards is in great trouble, apprehending immediate secessions. I inclose you his note (which I have torn inadvertently).

Would it be good for you to see the Bp. of Salisbury? A protest from him might be attended to, and might influence the decision of the Judges. J. Coleridge told me that he had no doubt that the Privy Council would reverse the judgment. But here is Dr. Lushington, a lawyer, concurring in it.

I only arrived here about 5.30 this morning. The Judgment really denies the Objective Presence as you will have seen: but what it condemns are points with which people have little sympathy. They only see indistinctly or do not see that the Objective Presence involves the reception by the Wicked, and few probably use any worship of Our Lord, except as in Heaven. God reward you.

Your very affectionate and grateful

E. B. P.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Llandudno, Conway, Aug. 16, 1856.

DEAREST PUSEY

It is only this morning that I have seen this miserable Judgment of Dr. L.'s and I want to ask you one or two things about it. (1) Whatever it is in respect of the point of reception by the Wicked (in regard of which I think it quite intolerable, although as you know I do not see my way in that point so clearly as Denison thinks he does), does it not also expressly condemn him, and by implication all who believe a Real Presence, on an entirely distinct ground, viz. that of Adoration? (2) Is there anything at all *in the Articles* to justify this? or to seem to justify it in the least? I only find one saying—'the Sacrament . . . was not by Christ's command . . . worshipped': which seems to me naturally to mean that outward Adoration, as well as Receiving and Elevation, were not absolutely necessary in the Sacrament. Had they meant more they would have said so, as in the matter of Transubstantiation. I could not have believed that even Dr. L. would have sharpened those words into anything so highly penal. Perhaps this was alleged in Dr. Phillimore's argument, but if so, I missed or have forgotten it. (3) Would it not be right for such as feel with me, that they are as obnoxious as Denison to this part of the sentence at least, to come forward in some way and state it, at the same time alleging reasons? And if so, in what way? by simple Protest? by addressing their Diocesans? or Convocation? or the whole Episcopate in Communion with the Church of England, in abeyance of any lawful Synod of that Church? I do not mean that such a Paper should confine itself to the matter of Adoration, but that it should state the truth on the other matter too: as well as on the abuse of the Queen's Supremacy—the unconstitutional and unfair tenor of the whole affair. I can fancy such a thing so done as to draw many adhesions and produce a considerable effect.

But it would very likely fail: and ought we not to be in some measure prepared beforehand for some course of action in that event?

God help us, and bless and reward you.

Your very loving

J. K.

But the difficulty of united action arose from some slight difference of opinion existing for a time between Keble and Pusey on the question of 'Reception by the Wicked.' Keble,

though he thought the Judgment on the point to be intolerable, could not exactly follow Pusey in his reasons for accepting the doctrine of Reception by the Wicked, and wrote to that effect a letter which appears in the Appendix to this chapter.

Pusey acknowledged this in a letter written in pencil on the railroad. He agreed with Keble that a strongly signed Declaration of belief in the Reality of our Lord's presence in the Holy Sacrament was desirable; and suggested a list of the names of those who might sign. The objects of such a Declaration would be, first, to deliver the souls of the signatories by declaring the truth; secondly, to influence the Privy Council; and thirdly, to offer themselves for attack as did the Christians before the Proconsul of Africa. 'If you slay us, you must decimate Carthage.' 'If,' Pusey argued, 'they do not condemn us too, the doctrine is not condemned.' Keble hesitated about the proposed Declaration: but still more about a generally signed Protest which was proposed at the time. He agreed that a 'vital doctrine of the Gospel had been in substance denied' by the decision of the Court at Bath. But the legal uncertainties of the case were very great; and it was undesirable to commit people, if it could be helped, to special forms of speaking, on such high matters. But Pusey did not think it advisable to delay a Declaration too long, if it was to be made at all. Present impatience would not be allayed by engagements to do something in the future. Nobody could say what the future might not bring forth. A mere Declaration, which did not involve some present action, would only again expose them to taunts such as those which Mr. Dodsworth and others had so constantly made since the Gorham case. He thought that they had better 'make themselves marks for others to shoot at.' If the opponents of the doctrine did not 'shoot or hit them,' the doctrine would be uncondemned. It was morally certain that if the technical objections against the proceedings were not sustained, the Archbishop, as Archbishop, would judge the case on its merits, on the same lines as Dr. Lushington had judged it at Bath. It was better to forestall this

contingency by a statement of doctrine which should make their position and responsibilities plain to all the world.

Pusey replied more at length to a remark of Keble's¹ that he found less sympathy than he had expected on the subject of Adoration of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist :—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Aug. 28, 1856.

I quite expected that we should have very few (yet some) who would commit themselves to the Adoration. I fear that the belief in the Real Presence is very often something very undefined : and among a large class, the presence of the Elements is a ground against Adoration, (as though in adoring Our Blessed Lord in the Flesh, people hesitated because of the dress under which it was veiled).

This makes me strongly think that whenever we make the Protest, we should not aim at any wide circulation (which might also produce a counter statement), but should select a certain number of names, whom people would not like to dislodge. For if the doctrine is re-affirmed, and not condemned, it is saved.

C. C. Bartholomew will join in signing, and he says that 200 of the Clergy in the Diocese have generally gone along with him.

What do you think that the Bp. of Exeter would do ? I should have been afraid that he would have been against 'Adoration.' I suppose that the Article has commonly been interpreted in an Anti-Roman sense, as against all Adoration. I am not surprised at Wilson being alarmed ; yet there would be enough, I doubt not, for a limited Protest. I suppose that, practically, people do not adore (i. e. it is no part of their worship), but they pray Christ to come into their souls.

As the time allowed by the Archbishop to Archdeacon Denison within which he might revoke the condemned statements was drawing to a close, Pusey became increasingly anxious.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Sep. 27, 1856.]

Time is hastening on, and the Archbishop's decision, and some tell me that people are looking much to you and me now. I fear that some will be disturbed, if the doctrine of the Reception by the Wicked is not re-asserted by *those who believe it*. I do not see how it can be re-asserted as matter of faith ; because I know not where it has been ruled to be so. Aquinas, I see, mentions those who imagine a withdrawal. Still, 1 Cor. xi. 29 looks so strongly the other way, that I do not know how otherwise it can be explained. And then the consent of Fathers is so large, and begins so early, that I do not see how we

¹ Cf. letter from Rev. J. K. to E. B. P. of August 26, 1856, on p. 462 below.

can avoid receiving it, if not as certain faith yet as the probable truth. I suppose that St. Augustine may most easily be explained, according to the distinction which has been inherited from him of 'spiritaliter' and 'sacramentaliter'; sacramentaliter being the mode of reception by the good and bad, spiritualiter by the good only, because in them only, the spirit or soul is united with Christ. With regard to our Lord's words (St. John vi.) which weighs so much with you, is it not the case, that all which God says implies certain conditions on man's part? 'He that believeth' [i.e. with a faith which worketh by love] 'and is baptized,' &c. : 'Whoso cometh unto Me' [i.e. truly and in sincerity] : 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them' [if penitent]. So I should have thought that our Lord's words 'Whoso eateth My Flesh,' &c. implied [with right dispositions, persevering in grace] &c. But I think I have written this before.

I should like very much to know what the Bp. of S. thought. I hear that the Bp. of O. is sanguine, that even Sir J. Dodgson will set it aside. But I fear that the Bp. does not believe the Objective Presence, although I suppose he believes a simultaneous reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the faithful.

Would a meeting of a few of us at the time of the Sentence be of any use?

I should like to see your statement again; but I fear that I must put out a statement of my own, because since I believe that the wicked do receive to their hurt, the Body and Blood of Christ, it would be cowardly not to say it now.

Ever, my dearest F.,

Your very affectionate and grateful

E. B. P.

I am to leave Christ Church early next week; on Saturday-Monday (Oct. 4-6) I am to be at the Vicarage, Brighton. I do not know on what day I am to be in London, nor exactly which day I leave, perhaps Monday. I am going to Great Malvern again to see Capt. Sellon.

Keble was greatly concerned that he and Pusey did not seem to be entirely at one on the point at issue, and on Sept. 28 wrote on the subject a long letter which will be found with others in the Appendix¹.

On Sept. 30 Archdeacon Denison handed into the registry of the diocese of Bath and Wells, a paper stating the grounds of argument and precedent upon which it was 'not in his power to make the revocation required by the Court.' Dr. Lushington at once announced that sentence would be pronounced by the Court at Bath on Tuesday, Oct. 21.

¹ Cf. p. 462 sqq.

The necessity for some Protest was now increasingly evident. It was currently reported that names of numbers of Anglicans were known, intending to join the Church of Rome as soon as the decision was issued. Pusey was anxious on the one hand to shew how slight was the difference between himself and Keble as to the expression regarding the Reception by the wicked, and on the other to shew, even more at length than before, why probability appeared to him to lie on the side he was advocating. Readers of these letters will be reminded in more ways than one of the correspondence of SS. Augustine and Jerome. Pusey's letter, which was a little treatise or pamphlet, will be found in the Appendix¹. The answer seems to shew that his learned and thoughtful arguments were making the way plain to Keble's assent².

After a conversation with the Bishop of Brechin, Pusey had drawn up a paper, which Keble consented to sign, if he might omit a passage from Bishop Poyntet about 'worshipping the Eucharist.' Although in meaning quite true, it would, says Keble, 'give needless pain and offence to some. Indeed, it is in words contrary to what Denison has said, "doubtless the Sacrament may not be worshipped"; also Bishop Andrewes—"Sacramentum nulli adoramus." Might not the passage from Bramhall, quoted by Denison, p. 13, be taken? or Taylor? or Beveridge?'

Keble always considered the Church of England to be under appeal,—to a General Council since the Reformation, or perhaps to a Synod of the whole English Episcopate since the decision of the Privy Council in the Gorham case. It was accordingly in his eyes no objection to an appeal to a free and lawful Synod of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury that Denison's advisers might recommend him to appeal to a law court as well. Certainly there would be two appeals; but they were in different provinces. 'Our appeal,' he wrote to Pusey, 'is to my mind the main point. I must have it (such is my *pertinacia*) if no one else does.'

It was during the final proceedings of the Court at Bath

¹ Cf. pp. 464-466.

² Cf. p. 466.

on Oct. 21st and 22nd, that Pusey's 'Protest,' with the single modification suggested by Keble, was made public. It may be well to point out that the signatories to the document wished to make clear their position that, in spite of the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament in question as stated by them was not repugnant to the Thirty-nine Articles. The point really at issue was whether this high Catholic sacramental doctrine was consistent with loyalty to the Church of England. Such a position they were prepared to vindicate. They felt strongly that it was the popular Protestant interpretation of the Articles, as distinct from the text of the Articles themselves that had governed the decision of the Court at Bath.

PROTEST.

The following Declaration has been signed and issued :—

Protest against the Bath Judgment.

We, the undersigned, priests of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, called by God's providence to minister in the Province of Canterbury according to the Book of Common Prayer, do hereby, in the presence of Almighty God, and in humble conformity with the tenor of our ordination vows, as we understand them, make known and declare as follows :—

1. We believe (in the words used in the Book of Homilies) that we 'receive the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the form of bread and wine'; and with Bishop Cosin, 'that upon the words of consecration, the body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this, not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible manner'; of which statement, Bishop Cosin says, 'it is confessed by all divines.'

2. We believe in the words of Bishop Ridley, 'that the partakinge of Christ's bodie and of His bloude unto the faithfull and godlie, is the partakinge and fellowship of life and of immortalitie. And, again, of the bad and ungodly receivers, St. Paul plainlie saieth thus: "He that eateth of this breade and drinketh of this cuppe unworthilie, he is guilty of the bodie and bloude of the Lord." He that eateth and drinketh unworthilie, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lord's Bodie; that is, he receiveth not the Lord's Bodie with the honoure whiche is due unto Hym.' Or with Bishop Poynt, 'that the Eucharist, so far as appertains to the nature of the Sacrament, is truly the body and blood of Christ, is a truly

divine and holy thing, even when it is taken by the unworthy ; while, however, they are not partakers of its grace and holiness, but eat and drink their own death and condemnation.'

3. We hold with Bishop Andrewes, 'that Christ Himself, the inward part of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, apart from and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be worshipped.' With whom agrees Archbishop Bramhall : 'The Sacrament is to be adored, says the Council of Trent, that is (formally), "the body and blood of Christ," say some of your authors ; we say the same : "the Sacrament," that is, "the species of bread and wine," say others—that we deny.'

We, therefore, being convinced,—

1. That the doctrine of the Real Presence of 'the body and blood of our Saviour Christ under the form of bread and wine' has been uniformly accepted by General Councils, as it is also embodied in our own formularies ;

2. That the interpretation of Scripture most commonly held in the Church has been, that the wicked, although they can 'in no wise be partakers of Christ,' nor 'spiritually eat His flesh and drink His blood,' yet do in the Sacrament not only take, but eat and drink unworthily to their own condemnation the body and blood of Christ which they do not discern ;

3. That the practice of worshipping Christ then and there especially present, after consecration and before communicating, has been common throughout the Church. And, moreover, that the Thirty-nine Articles were intended to be, and are, in harmony with the faith and teaching of the ancient undivided Church ;

Do hereby protest earnestly against so much of the opinion of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, as implies, directly or indirectly, that such statements as we have cited above are repugnant to the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles.

And we appeal from the said opinion, decision, or sentence of his Grace, in the first instance, to a free and lawful Synod of all the Churches of our communion, when such by God's mercy may be had.

BARTHOLOMEW, C. C., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. David's,
Exeter.

BENNETT, W. J. E., M.A., Vicar of Frome.

CARTER, THOMAS T., M.A., Rector of Clewer, Oxon.

GRUEBER, C. S., Incumbent of St. James's, Hambridge.

HEATHCOTE, W. B., B.C.L., Precentor of Salisbury Cathedral.

HENDERSON, T., M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Vicar of
Messing.

KEBLE, JOHN, M.A., Vicar of Hursley, Winchester.

NEALE, J. M., M.A., Sackville College.

OXENHAM, N., M.A., Vicar of Modbury.

PLUMER, C. J., M.A., Rector of Elstree, Rochester.

POPHAM, J. L., M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury, Rector of Chilton
Folliatt.

PUSEY, E. B., D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

SCOTT, W., B.D., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Hoxton, London.

STUART, E., M.A., Incumbent of St. Mary Magdalene. Munster Square, London.

WARD, W. P., M.A., Rector of Compton-Vallence.

WILLIAMS, ISAAC, B.D., Stinchcombe, Gloucestershire.

WOODFORD, J. R., M.A., Vicar of Kempsford, Gloucestershire.

YARD, G. B., M.A., Rector of East Torrington with Wragby, Lincolnshire.

On October 22, Dr. Lushington proceeded to pronounce sentence on Archdeacon Denison. By the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, he was deprived of all his preferments; an interval extending to Dec. 5 being granted for an appeal.

Meanwhile the Protest was being circulated in high quarters.

‘I am sending one,’ writes Pusey to Keble in October, 1856, ‘with a letter to the Archbishop and other Bishops (except Hereford), leaving it to you to send one with a private letter (as I suppose you will) to the Bishop of Winchester. I said to the Archbishop that it was a matter of conscience after his Grace’s decision, to state publicly what I believed, in order that my subscription might be honest.’

The Protest did not win much sympathy from the Bishops to whom it was sent with the exception of the Bishop of Exeter; he however proposed a less strongly worded declaration with a view to its being more generally signed, although he allowed that the judgment condemned Bishop Andrewes and misquoted the Articles.

‘The Bishop of O.’ wrote Pusey to Keble, ‘discourages signing¹. The Bishops of B. and W. and St. Asaph think it premature. T. Carter of Clewer wants a meeting to get more signatures. Perceval Ward and Grueber suggested alterations. “Quot homines, tot sententiae.” Meanwhile our act is, I suppose, done, past recall: that is one comfort. But will you think whether you would advise anything more?’

Keble agreed with the Bishop of Exeter’s suggestion. But, he added:—

‘Oct. 28, 1856.

‘It will not do to confine the statement to the Adoration as he has done. I have written to S. O. to ask what we should do next, assuming

¹ See ‘Life of Bp. Wilberforce,’ ii. 328.

in my simplicity that we had done right so far ! I shall be curious to see his answer. I dread the Bishop of W.'s, which I have not yet received. As you say, the thing being out is a real comfort ; and if we made a mistake we did it for the best. Those who do not believe as we do can hardly be judges. I wrote to Gresley yesterday, on a plan of a mitigated Declaration, which he had sent me proposing divers additions. We are keeping our Consecration Feast to-day, and I have no time. No doubt the cold water from Oxford will quench for the present the spark at Sarum : so I fear.'

Large numbers of clergymen and others were anxious to sign the Protest. But Keble did not think this desirable. A large number of signatures might look like an attempt to influence the Law Courts. He wished simply for a Church Defence Fund.

Another question was raised both by friends and opponents. What should be the effect of the Archbishop's Judgment in the court of conscience ? Pusey writes :—

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Oct. 31, 1856.

The Master of Pembroke seemed to think that our opponents would expect that if the Archbishop's Judgment were confirmed, we should acquiesce and resign as matter of course, accepting his Judgment as the legal interpretation. But the interpretation of an Archbishop alone, though it may make a legal interpretation, cannot bind a conscience. Do you think that it would be best to show our line of policy that people may not say again, that we hold out what we do not fulfil ? Unjustly, in both cases.

It appeared to Pusey to be important to make the future action of himself and his friends perfectly clear. Whatever their opponents might wish, or decide to be honourable or imperative, he and his friends had no intention of abandoning their duties in and towards the Church of England until they were ejected from the posts they held. Accordingly at the end of October Pusey drew up a letter, stating the grounds of the Protest against the decision of the Court at Bath. The letter ran as follows :—

'It having been given out that those who signed the Protest and Appeal against the recent decision on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist may probably end in forming a Nonjuring Church, will you allow us to state through your paper that we have no such intention

or thought. The object of that declaration was to liberate our own consciences.

'We believe, in their most literal and fullest sense, every word of the Articles, on the ground of which Archdeacon Denison has been condemned. We cannot see how the doctrines for which he has been condemned can be fairly brought under the Articles. We are convinced that they are points upon which the Church of England has not decided; and that those who have condemned him, have proceeded on grounds foreign to the Articles. They have brought meanings *into* the Articles, not *out* of them. Still, since we believe that which the Archbishop and his Assessors have condemned as contrary to the Articles, it became matter of honesty to avow it. We are in a place of sacred trust. If we voluntarily retire from our place, we betray our trust; if we continue in our place, saying nothing, we *seem* to betray it. Either way there is grievous scandal. The only course open to us is, publicly to apprise those in authority over us, that we cannot obey them in this, and to go on as before, leaving it to them to interfere with us, or no, as they may think fit. It was on this view of our duty that we signed that Paper. Our subscription to the Articles is honest in itself, for we believe them in the only sense of which we can see them to be capable. But we did not feel it honest to hold a belief which had been condemned as contrary to the Articles, and not to avow that we held it, and make ourselves liable to the consequences.

'The being of the Church of England we believe to be perfectly unaffected by this decision, grievous as the result of it may be in respect of her well-being. The sentence of an Archbishop's Court may make an Act penal; but the sentence of one man cannot bind the conscience. Prosecution after prosecution can but deprive individuals. Nothing less than the voice of the Church can make any decision the judgment of the Church; and nothing but the judgment of the Church (in fact, a new "Article of Religion") can limit, as now proposed, the meaning of the present Articles. If the Church of England should will to condemn what hitherto she has not condemned, she must do it by a distinct Act.

'We know there are some who wish us to be removed. But we do not, please God, intend to do their work for them by withdrawing. Even should we be deprived, we should hope not to be silenced, nor degraded, nor excommunicated. Meantime, in full conviction that we teach only what the Church sanctions, or at any rate allows, we shall go on teaching as long as we are permitted to do so. Through God's good Providence we have had our several spheres of duty assigned to us. If it be His will, He will help us cheerfully to exchange them for others. But it will be *His* doing, not ours. We hope to know His Will best, by waiting for it.'

¹ Cf. 'On Eucharistical Adoration,' by Rev. J. Keble, 3rd ed., pp. 181, 182.

Keble warmly approved of the letter. He had himself revised it. 'Every day shows me,' he wrote, 'that some such thing is needed. . . . I hope you will not grudge me what I do not quite deserve,—my name at the foot of that letter.'

The importance of this explanation will be at once apparent. Pusey and Keble did not mean to secede to the Church of Rome, or to form a Nonjuring Church. They meant to stay where they were; but they did not mean to hold their tongues. 'Make that new Paper,' Keble had written to Pusey, 'such as to commit no one but us two, any more than is possible, consistently with it committing *us entirely*.' They themselves were prepared for any consequences. The paper however was not published at the time: it raised fresh questions about which it was found impossible to secure the complete agreement of all the signatories of the Protest.

But meanwhile Archdeacon Denison had appealed from the sentence at Bath to the Court of Arches. Although the Archbishop of Canterbury had presided in person at the Court at Bath, he had only done so as the Judge of the Diocesan Court of Bath and Wells; he had taken the place of the Bishop of the diocese, because the latter was disqualified for hearing the case by being patron of the benefices held by the defendant. The Court of Arches, however, in the first instance, refused to admit the appeal, on the ground that the Archbishop, whose Court it was, had already passed sentence on the defendant. This refusal was overruled, on appeal, by a *mandamus* from the Queen's Bench, which held that the appeal lay not from the Archbishop in person to the Archbishop's Court, but from the Diocesan Court of Bath and Wells to the Provincial Court of Canterbury. Accordingly on April 23, 1857, Sir John Dodson, Dean of the Arches, reversed the decision of the Court at Bath on the technical ground that the suit on which the Archdeacon had been deprived had not been taken against him within the time required by the Church Discipline

Act. Mr. Ditcher hereupon appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which on Feb. 6, 1858, confirmed the decision of the Court of Arches, without expressing any opinion on the question of heterodoxy. This brought the case to an end, but in a manner which exposed the Archdeacon to the charge, freely advanced by his theological opponents, that he had shielded himself from a decision on the merits of the case under a legal technicality. The Archdeacon, however, has told the world, in his own vigorous style, what he thought of this point, as well as of the whole case ¹.

This controversy produced two books which will be remembered and read when all the incidents connected with it are forgotten. We have seen that the point in the Judgment which touched Keble most closely led to his composing what is perhaps the most beautiful of his contributions to the theological treasures of the Church of England,—his treatise on 'Eucharistical Adoration.' Keble fell back on authority no doubt; but he also rested on general considerations suggested by the requirements of faith and the instincts of piety. His book is consequently almost as much a devotional treatise as a theological disquisition; and it is lighted up, here and there, by touches of the poetry which played like sunshine round Keble's deepest thought. It was not his way to set store on anything that he did: he was impatient of allusions in conversation to the 'Christian Year,' which he would refer to without naming as 'that book.' But he was really anxious that people should read what he had written on the worship of our Lord in the Eucharist. 'I wish,' he said one morning after opening his letters, 'that people, instead of paying me compliments about what they call my poetry, would see if there is not some sense in my prose. You know what I mean.'

Pusey's work was of a different character from Keble's, though one topic in it covered the same ground. He had before him a more prosaic task, that, namely, of

¹ 'Notes of my Life,' pp. 242, 243.

shewing that his teaching on the question of the Eucharist was consistent with honest subscription to the formularies of the Church of England. In his book on the 'Nature of Christ's Presence in the Holy Communion,' Mr. Goode had raised this question; which was to be decided, he maintained, 'not by an appeal to Holy Scripture, interpreted by the private judgment of individuals' (the writer for the moment surely forgot what was due to really Protestant principles), 'still less by an appeal to the Fathers' (it would certainly have been very imprudent for the writer to discuss the subject in *that* field of inquiry), 'but by an appeal to the authoritative formularies of our Church.' Pusey's book, therefore, from the necessity of the case, is throughout an appeal to texts and documents; and much of it is discussion of so minute and technical a character as to repel any but a person who is deeply interested in ascertaining the true answer to the question what, by her formularies, the Church of England does or does not teach, permit, or exclude on the subject of the Holy Eucharist.

The treatise on the 'Real Presence,' considered as the doctrine of the English Church, is, after all, only a fragment. Pusey had intended to add to it a vindication of the literal interpretation of the Words of Institution; a reassertion of the belief of the Fathers on the subject; and a comparison of the English Sacramental Articles with the Confessions of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic bodies. He had hoped to produce this work before Archdeacon Denison's case came into the Court of Arches: but the collapse of the case, and his own broken health, led him to content himself with the existing work. He was longing, too, to address himself to tasks which would divide him not from Christians who held a less perfect faith, but from unbelievers. 'While we who would love Christ are thus engaged in attack and defence, infidelity finds its way undisputed, the Old Testament is given over to unbelievers, our Redeemer is blasphemed, His Godhead, His Atonement, or even His Existence are denied.'

Both of Pusey's considerable works on the Eucharist were criticized at some length by a Low Church clergyman of industry and reading, who however can scarcely be thought to have known how to arrange or interpret his materials. When Dr. Harrison's 'Answer to Dr. Pusey's Challenge' appeared fourteen years after the publication of the 'Real Presence in the English Church,' Pusey only expressed his great satisfaction that a person belonging to that school should have induced some of those who agreed with him to read the Fathers, and his confidence that if they persevered in the study they would be brought nearly, if not entirely, into agreement with himself.

A controversy of a similar character was raised at the same time in another quarter. It has been mentioned that the Rev. A. P. Forbes was chosen, while Vicar of St. Saviour's, Leeds, to be Bishop of the Diocese of Brechin. It is unnecessary here to speak of the way in which Bishop Forbes recommended himself to various classes of men, by the charm of his manner, or his theological knowledge, by his devotion to the poor, and in general by the high ideal of Episcopal life which he endeavoured to translate into action. His episcopate, however, was not without its anxieties and troubles. His primary Charge, delivered on August 5, 1857, in some respects reflected the controversies connected in England with the trial of Archdeacon Denison's case, and was combined in Scotland with the long-standing discussions about the Scotch Communion Office. The Bishop, besides warmly recommending this office, insisted especially that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that on the Cross; that 'supreme adoration is due to the Body and Blood of Christ, mysteriously present in the gifts,' and that such 'worship is due not to the gifts, but to Christ in the gifts'; and that 'in some sense the wicked do receive Christ indeed to their condemnation.' The Bishop further asserted that 'the Church to which we belong never committed herself

to any expression which forbids the worship of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament.'

The Charge excited general attention, and some considerable hostility. At the Synod held in Edinburgh in December, 1857, it was proposed to issue a declaration on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, in opposition to the statements of the Bishop of Brechin. The motion was lost; but the Bishops of Edinburgh, Argyll, and Glasgow, signed a document which, if not identical with that proposed, was to the same purport. They denied that the Body and Blood of Christ were so present in the Eucharist as to be proper objects of adoration; they held adoration to be repudiated by the declaration at the end of the Communion Office; they objected to the Bishop of Brechin's statement of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as implying a divergence between the teaching of the Primitive Church and the 25th Article, and as being opposed to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the language of the Scottish Communion Office. On the other hand, they quoted the positive language of the Catechism and the Homily as expressing their belief on the subject. This declaration of the three Bishops was followed by others from the clergy, which kept the subject before the public mind.

Meanwhile Keble, soon after the appearance of Bishop Forbes' Charge, had sent his book on 'Eucharistical Adoration,' then just published, to the Scottish Bishops. His chivalrous impetuosity led him thus to throw in his lot with Bishop Forbes: and when he received a copy of the Episcopal declaration, he understood it to condemn his own book as well as the Bishop's Charge. This induced him to address to the Bishop of Edinburgh a letter which, read together with the declaration, is one of the most instructive documents produced in the whole course of the controversy¹. The point on which he principally insists is the impossibility of distinguishing, as did the Scottish critics of the Bishop

¹ It is given at length by the Rev. D. J. Mackay, 'Life of Bishop Forbes,' pp. 101 sqq.

of Brechin, between the Presence of the Body of Christ and the Presence of His Person. If His Body was really, and not only virtually present, then all believers who were not Nestorians, must admit that His Person was present as well; since in Him two whole and perfect Natures were joined together in One Person, never to be divided.

Pusey had spent the winter of 1857-8 in the neighbourhood of Paris. Philip wanted to go there to work at manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Impériale. During his previous illness, and his absence in Paris, Pusey heard nothing of the Scottish controversy: it burst upon him, as a most unwelcome surprise, soon after his return. Keble wrote to deprecate his taking any immediate action.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Quinquagesima Sunday, 1858.

DEAREST PUSEY,

. . . I am so sorry this storm has reached your ears. But if Bishop Forbes will be quite patient, as I trust he will, there seems hope of its turning to good. I believe the Bishops of St. Andrews and Moray and Aberdeen are all peaceably inclined. But the pressure from the Edinburgh and other laity is excessive.

It is in vain to ask you not to be anxious about it: but I do hope you will not be tempted to hurt yourself—by *working*. You, and in some sense I, have done what we could, in the way of publication, and we must on the whole leave the result in God's hands.

If you are not much acquainted with those gentlemen, would it not be a good plan to ask leave to send your book? If they said yes, I suppose they would be pledging themselves to read it.

What I want to impress them all with is that we are on the defensive, and only ask for toleration. And this I believe Bishop Forbes accepts.

I wish you had been well, for then I dare say you would have stopped him from bringing forward the subject. . . .

Ever your very affectionate

J. K.

Pusey however entered into correspondence with some of the Scotch Bishops with whom he was acquainted, but with ill success. Bishop Trower in particular expressed complete disagreement both with Pusey's own Eucharistic position and with that of Bishop Forbes, and intimated that 'Neological' tendencies now developing were only a natural reaction against Pusey's own teaching.

Pusey, when forwarding this letter to Keble, observes :—

‘Bishop F. tells me that he expects a renewal of the storm (which he says is now a little lulled) on the appearance of Mr. Cheyne’s sermons ; so I have written to Mr. C. to ask him to let you or me see them before they are published. I wish I had seen Bishop F.’s. However, the Bishop of G.’s antipathy seems to be to any Adoration whatsoever ; so that, although I could have hindered this attack on the doctrine of the Sacrifice, the storm must have come equally.

So they comfort themselves by thinking that I am, by reaction, the cause of the Neologism. How utterly ignorant they are of its history and growth ! I could say, Would that it were true that reaction were the cause. It would then be less widespread and less deep.

‘On Saturday Bull’s remains were consigned to their resting-place. It is nearly thirty-nine years since, as an undergraduate, I first came into relation with him.’

Matters looked brighter for the Bishop of Brechin before the Scottish Synod met in May : and this happier interval is reflected in the subjoined letter.

REV. J. KEBLE TO THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN.

Hursley, April 13, 1858.

MY DEAR LORD AND MY DEAR FRIEND,

Thank you for rejoicing my heart as you did by the last words of your last letter. If the holy times are by God’s mercy blessed to us to bear ‘peaceable fruit’ within, who can doubt that in His good time it will distil, as it were, in outward peace on the Church ? And what a token, if one may reverently say so, of some good thing in store for us, that our dear friend at Christ Church should be so far restored as he is—protected from worry and controversy, yet enabled to give good advice to a friend like yourself, to preach to the hearts of young men, and to work ‘with all the desire of his soul’ on what he had been so many years vainly seeking leisure to accomplish. One ‘cannot think enough of it,’ as the good people say here.

I return the No. of the Journal: I have it sent regularly to me, so that I had seen the paper on Ridley before ; your conjecture had not struck me, but I think it very probable. I hope in a few days to have leisure to compare it critically with Ridley’s works, which I have not within reach here. In the meantime I should be very much surprised if I found a person exactly in agreement with Antiquity who could find it in his heart to overthrow altars as Bishop Ridley did. I shall see if I can make any further use of my letter to Freeman—but I am in great hopes that it may be safely put off to a quieter time.

Believe me, ever your affectionate friend and servant in Christ,

J. KEBLE.

The Synod which met at Edinburgh in the following month determined on the issue of a Pastoral Letter, addressed 'To all faithful members of the Church in Scotland,' and signed by all the Scottish Bishops, excepting Bishop Forbes. This document is dated May 27, 1858: it expresses the unanimous regret of the six Bishops that such a Charge as the Bishop of Brechin's should have been delivered: it uses severe language as to the character and tendency of the views therein set forth: and, while acknowledging and approving the reverent intention of the Charge, it fastens upon two points as unscriptural and unsound; denouncing especially the Bishop's language as to the supreme adoration due 'to Christ in the Gifts,' and as to the identity 'in some transcendental sense' of the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar. From a censure of this teaching and a summary dismissal of the reasoning by which it had been supported, the Bishops proceed to offer to their brethren of the clergy, 'by a right essentially inherent in a Provincial Episcopate,' certain instructions, three in number, as to what they are and what they are not to teach concerning the Holy Eucharist.

On the promulgation of this document Bishop Forbes, in great distress, wrote at once to Pusey; who, in a somewhat pathetic letter, forwarded his note to Keble. Pusey was still poorly in health: he could not quite wholeheartedly commend in all respects the course which the Bishop of Brechin had taken: he was harassed by some other anxieties, both personal and academic. But there was no hesitation in his eagerness to do all he could for the truth which he felt to be imperilled and the consciences which were perplexed in the vehemence of the controversy. He would have gone at once to confer with Keble as to the best advice to be offered to the Bishop, but he was detained at Oxford by the sense of an obligation to be at the Cathedral. 'We have been making an effort (he writes) to have Holy Communion restored here on Trinity Sunday, which had been left off when the Ordination ceased to be held here; and it seemed inconsistent to press

its restoration and then to go away.' At the end of the first week in June, however, he was able to go, and spent a Sunday with Keble: and soon afterwards two letters show the outcome of their conference. Keble had written a long pamphlet, entitled, 'Considerations suggested by a late Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist': and Pusey revised the proof-sheets, suggesting various emendations, and also contributing a short paper which Keble appended to his own work, as a summary of the main reasons 'for not accepting either the censures on the Bishop of Brechin, or the doctrinal and historical statements of the Letter, as they stand ¹.'

Keble had a recognized place among the Scottish clergy as an Honorary Canon of Cumbrae: he could not be charged with intrusiveness when he laid before them the outcome of his study of the Pastoral Letter which the Bishops had addressed to them: while the publication in the preceding year of his treatise 'On Eucharistical Adoration' gave fitness as well as weight to what he now put forth. He begins by dwelling on the reasons why the clergy may and should 'assume that the Pastoral Letter was not intended to be received as having any canonical authority, but simply as the result of counsel gravely taken by those six individual Bishops'; a result therefore commanding attention and respect, but still leaving 'room for dissent, silence, or remonstrance, as the case may require, without undutifulness.' The whole letter is most valuable, not only as regards its discussion of the negative positions of the Scotch Bishops, but also in that it set forth a series of dogmatical statements showing 'the special bearing of the Incarnation on the Eucharistical question.'

Two documents form the concluding pages of the pamphlet: for both Keble says he 'is indebted to kind and venerated friends': and some allusions in a letter from Pusey written on July the 16th show that the former of the two was his work. It is a brief statement of the main reasons which would make it impossible for Church-

¹ J. Keble, 'Considerations, &c.' p. 46.

men at large to adopt in any way or express any acceptance of the Pastoral Letter. These reasons are drawn from the character of its judicial, doctrinal, and historical statements: and they are summed up by Pusey in the following paragraph:—

‘It seems to me, in itself, a sufficient argument that the six Bishops cannot mean us to adopt their Pastoral Letter, that it would involve, (1) a direct but extrajudicial and unjudicial condemnation of a Bishop by Presbyters of other Dioceses; and that, (2) for language which is not the language of the Bishop, and itself in part not carefully worded; (3) the adoption of new Articles of Religion, not drawn up in the form of Articles, nor in definite, unambiguous language; (4) it would involve also an indirect acknowledgment of a Canon which the Church of Scotland has never been called upon to acknowledge, and without any explanation of its bearing; and (5) an assent to historical opinions, such as the clergy are nowhere called upon to subscribe¹.’

The second of the two documents attached to Keble’s ‘Considerations’ is ‘a draft of certain propositions, such as a Diocesan Synod might perhaps safely, and not unprofitably, adopt, by way of substitute for acceptance of the Pastoral Letter.’

Throughout the later months of 1858 and the earlier of 1859 fresh causes for anxiety arose as to the course of events in the Scottish Church. Special attacks were made on individual clergymen for expressed agreement with the doctrine impugned, and there was in consequence some talk of a re-affirmation of their faith by those Presbyters who held with Bishop Forbes, in regard to the Holy Eucharist. Pusey writes to Keble on Dec. 29, 1858, evincing great anxiety as to the state of affairs in Scotland.

‘I suppose,’ he writes, ‘that this controversy will bring to light that there is no medium between real absence and Real Presence; and that’ those who ‘refuse to believe the Real Objective Presence “under the form of bread and wine,” really hold nothing more than Calvin, “a presence of virtue and efficacy,” i.e. (as opposed to that Real Objective Presence) Divine grace from our Lord in heaven. . . .

¹ In a previous paragraph Pusey had pointed out how the language of the Pastoral Letter recalled the ‘hardship inflicted on the members of the *Porte Royale*,’ when they were required not only to condemn certain

propositions, but also ‘to affirm that those propositions were contained in the works of one whom they revered,’ ‘where they believed that they were not contained.’

They must mean that our Lord being absent in heaven, produces certain effects on our souls.'

In the middle of 1859 he writes to his son Philip: 'There is a prospect of a most deadly war for truth in Scotland. . . . I suppose that the next few months will clear the battlefield, one way or another ; which, God only knows.' These anticipations were soon decisively fulfilled : for on October 3 the Bishop was formally presented before the Episcopal Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, on a charge of holding and maintaining and teaching in his Charge on Aug. 5, 1857, doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion, the Word of God, the Formularies of Public Worship, and the Scotch Communion Office. It was appointed that the Respondent should lodge answers to the presentment with the Clerk of the Court on or before January 7, and that the case should be heard on February 7.

The situation was clearly one in which the greatest care was necessary if doctrinal consequences were to be avoided, and the wide sense of peril is shown in letters from Sir John Coleridge to Pusey. 'I am overwhelmed,' he writes on October 11, 'by the Brechin troubles. I cannot tell you how much I fear them.' Two days later a letter from Bishop Forbes had given prominence in Pusey's mind to another fear, namely, that of the Bishop's retirement if wrongly deposed, and he writes :—

'I had thought that he (the Bishop of Brechin) looked upon his holding his Bishopric if deposed as a thing impossible. . . . But no orthodox Bishop would have given up his see because an Arian deposed him. It is, of course, an unheard-of thing that some six Bishops should have the power of deposing a seventh without any appeal. Probably, too, successful persecution would become a ground for persecution in England, so that he might think of himself as fighting the battle of the Faith in England.'

Throughout November and December complicated negotiations were going on, in order that, if possible, the proceedings might yet be stayed, or broken off. It was specially urged upon the Scottish Bishops that there was a grave unseemliness in their sitting in formal judgment on a document against which they had already committed

themselves by their Pastoral Letter. Sir John Coleridge writes to Pusey on this side of the question on Dec. 4 :—

‘If the peace is not made, I hope the Bishop of Brechin will make a part of his defence to be the position in which the Bishops have placed themselves—and specially challenge the Bishop of St. Andrews. He may safely say that no Judge in England would try a Charge under the same circumstances.’

But the surrounding difficulties were such as to make a satisfactory outcome of the negotiations impossible. Mr. Gladstone and Sir John Coleridge had used their influence to forward a peaceful settlement of the troubles, and at one moment there seemed a clear hope that such a settlement might be effected : but the hope soon passed away. On Dec. 31 Bishop Forbes writes to Mr. Gladstone, ‘I have heard from the Primus, announcing the failure of his mediation. The trial must now take its course ¹.’

The Bishop’s Defence in answer to the Presentment was to be sent in by January 7, and Pusey spent much labour in helping him to prepare it. In its printed form, after the retrenchment of those portions ‘which were not properly of a theological character,’ it forms an octavo volume of 230 pages ; and when the Synod met on Feb. 7 two days were occupied in hearing the Bishop read it. On the third day ² the presenter read his reply, or ‘Pleadings,’ a pamphlet of 89 pages ; and the Court then adjourned till March 14, having appointed that in the interval the Bishop should make a printed Reply on or before February 23.

It was, apparently, soon after the publication of this Reply that the Bishop of Brechin was sounded as to the possibility of his putting forth an explanation of his language which might make it possible for the Synod to confine itself to a brotherly exhortation on the disadvantage of polemical discussion, and several letters passed between him and Pusey in regard to the proposals thus made. But nothing came of this effort.

¹ ‘Life of Bp. Forbes.’ D. J. Mackay, p. 129.

² A wish had been expressed that Dr. Pusey should be with the Bishop

for these days: but he demurred, thinking that his presence ‘would do harm rather than good,’ and Mr. Keble seems to have gone in his stead.

When the trial came on on March 14 Keble and Mr. George Williams were among those of the Bishop's friends who were present. The Bishop's 'Reply to the Pleadings' was taken as read, and the proceedings were merely formal : on the following day the Synod met again, and the Primus (the Bishop of Edinburgh), the Bishop of Moray, and the Bishop of St. Andrews read statements of their reasons for concurring in the judgment about to be given. This judgment, 'the unanimous finding of the Court,' was then read by the Bishop of Glasgow. The Court finds the first and second charges of the presentment proven, holding that in regard to the identity of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and in regard to the adoration due to the Body and Blood of Christ mysteriously present in the Gifts, 'the teaching of the respondent there complained of is unsanctioned by the Articles and formularies of the Church, and is to a certain extent inconsistent therewith.' The third charge, relating to the Bishop's language about the reception of Christ by the wicked, is found not proven : of the three passages inculcated by the fourth charge one had been withdrawn by the Bishop, the other two were dealt with by the finding of the Court upon the second charge. The judgment then ends thus :—

'In consideration of the explanations and modifications offered by the respondent in his answers in reference to the first charge, and in consideration also that the respondent now only asks toleration for his opinions, and does not claim for them the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction,—we, the said College of Bishops, feel that we shall best discharge our duty in this painful case by limiting our sentence to a declaration of censure and admonition ; and we do now solemnly admonish, and in all brotherly love entreat, the Bishop of Brechin to be more careful for the future, so that no fresh occasion may be given for trouble and offence, such as have arisen from the delivery and publication of the Primary Charge to his clergy complained of in the presentment ; and we declare the proceedings in this case to be now concluded.'

Precise and exact accuracy of statement, both as to facts and doctrines asserted or implied, should have been

indisputable in a judgment pronounced in such circumstances. Such, however, was not the case. Several severe criticisms were passed upon it ; Pusey himself pointed out that there were misleading suggestions in the document in regard to the Bishop's conduct. The judgment, for instance, spoke of *modifications* offered by the Bishop in reference to the first charge : the plural was unwarranted, for the only withdrawal which the Bishop made under that head was to substitute a very emphatic passage of St. Cyril of Alexandria, provided that the judges would accept it, instead of language of his own¹. Again, the judgment says that the Bishop does not 'now' claim more than toleration. He never claimed more. The 'now' is therefore superfluous and suggests an incorrect idea. The judgment says that the Bishop 'does not claim for them (his opinions) the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction.' While the latter clause is true, nothing would have been further from the Bishop's mind than to allow that he had taught simply his own 'opinions' and that he could not claim for them the authority of the Church 'in the sense of her expressed mind, and as a practical guide to the faith of her children.'

It has seemed right to notice these very unfortunate suggestions in the judgment of the Synod, because they account for the deep dissatisfaction which Pusey expresses in regard to it, and for the distress which Bishop Forbes felt at its exposing him to serious misunderstanding. Against such misunderstanding he tried to guard himself in the Address which he delivered to the annual Synod of his diocese on August 1, 1860.

The Bishop's Address, after treating of the three points indicated to him by Pusey, passes on to the various dangers which follow or attend the stress of controversy, and brings before the clergy the need amidst such trials of strenuous devotion to duty, constancy in prayer, regularity in the daily office, frequency of Communion, deepening in special

¹ Cf. 'Theological Defence,' p. 55.

seasons of retirement the spiritual life, and seeking grace 'to maintain and set forward. as much as lieth in us, quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people.' At the end of this Statement the following resolution was carried with but two dissentients (one of these two being the clergyman who had made the presentment against the Bishop):—

'That this Synod, having heard the Bishop's explanatory statement with regard to his teaching on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, desires to express its adherence thereto, and, with his permission, to have the same recorded in the books of the Synod.'

The three years' conflict over the Bishop's Primary Charge was closed. Here, for the present, it is necessary to leave the great Sacramental controversy. It is evident that both in England and Scotland the majority of the ecclesiastical authorities was still hostile to the Catholic teaching, which as yet they had failed adequately to grasp. But in England their hands were providentially stayed by legal informalities; and in Scotland the adverse sentence lost moral weight through the circumstances in which it was delivered. Within a few years, however, the whole question was to be raised again, and then the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided (in the case of *Sheppard versus Bennett*)—on a strictly legal interpretation of the Formularies, that the whole position for which the Tractarians had contended through the anxious years of misunderstanding and reproach was permissible within the limits of the teaching of the Church of England.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XVII.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

35 Grosvenor Square, Aug. 19, 1856.

Up to a certain time I doubted about the [Reception by the] wicked, on the grounds which I put in my Letter to the Bishop of London. It was quite clear that they did not receive Christ into their souls; since then He dwelt where His Body and Blood was received, how could His Body and Blood be received by them? On the other hand, I saw no ground to affirm (as Palmer on the Church did) that that Presence was withdrawn. Then St. Augustine's authority on the one side, as quoted by the Article, seemed to me very strong; and the words look stronger still, if the words, inserted probably by Bede¹, be omitted.

Dr. Döllinger suggested an answer to my abstract difficulty, which I could not but feel to be an answer, viz. that our Lord might be present within the wicked, as God is present in Hell, as a Judge, not a Redeemer. And then, on looking into it, though that passage is a difficulty, there are explicit statements of his and others, that Judas, and that other wicked, received. This, too, is the most natural sense of Holy Scripture, not discerning or distinguishing the Lord's Body. So I came timidly to receive it, as also the doctrine of the Adoration, from which I had been withheld by the continuance of the visible elements.

I have been waiting partly to confer with you and have your opinion: partly, too, I have not your Paper with me. I am very glad that you are thinking of it. It seemed to me that, sooner or later, we who believe that the truth is impugned must speak out. Only I wished not to seem headlong, or to speak before you. The extreme party would be glad to precipitate us all. . . . Anyhow we must risk condemnation, I think.

¹ Hom. 26 in Joh. § 18, p. 412, Oxf. Tr., quoted in Art. XXIX. The words 'spiritaliter' and 'licet carnaliter et visibiliter premit dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi,' are

bracketed by the Benedictine Editors on the authority of the MSS., yet retained in the text on the authority of the Editor. 'Letter to Bishop of London,' p. 59.

The Judgment appears to me utterly inconsistent. (1) They do *not* find Archdeacon D. guilty on the count which charged him with believing that the Real Presence was consequent on the Consecration. Thus they virtually allow the Objective Presence. Then they make their own positive statement, which affirms a presence not objective. Thus they condemn D. on those two points or grounds denying the Objective Presence, which they had previously not condemned.

I thought that an argument by Grueber was forcible, showing from the Exhortations that the Liturgy does teach the Reception by the Wicked.

As to the Articles, Art. 25 seems to me in favour of the Reception by the Wicked; and the body of Art. 29 certainly does not deny it, and I have construed the heading to agree with it, 'eat not' (as in St. John vi.) 'eat not beneficially.'

I construe 'The Sacraments,' Art. 29, as you do. And, over and above, Archdeacon D. says that he does not adore the Sacrament, but Christ present there: as does Bishop Andrewes. So I am in good heart that this doctrine cannot be finally condemned. . . .

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Capel Curig, Aug. 20 [1856].

. . . I will try and explain what my difficulty is in closing with the view of Reception by the Wicked. It is not anything in the way of reasoning—supposed painful consequences, or the like—but it is the sayings of our Lord in St. John vi., and St. Augustine's commentary on them in his Tract on that part. I put it to myself in this way. (I hope it is not irreverent to use such a form.)

Whoso eateth That Flesh, &c., hath eternal life (by St. John vi. 54); but whosoever eateth and drinketh in Holy Communion, eateth That Flesh, &c. (by 1 Cor. x. 16): ∴ all communicants have eternal life. Which conclusion being manifestly false, yet directly following on the premises, one of the premises must be modified—by some such word as *worthily*. How am I to know *which*? unless there were an authoritative decision of the whole Church, or a clear consensus of Fathers. I do not see that there is either: and therefore, so far as I see at present, the point ought to be left open. I might incline to your opinion (at present I rather incline to the other), but I have no right to press it as a necessary consequence of the Real Presence: and this seems to me Denison's mistake. And the mistake seems just as great when people force on you the other alternative: as great in itself, infinitely greater, as connected with a denial of the Real Presence. If I have made myself understood, you will see why I have worded the latter part of the Paper I sent you in that way: not as an economy merely, but to do justice to my own view.

I am quite prepared to find but few concurring with us: but yet, as far as I see now, I could not be happy without some kind of speaking out. For the *how*, and the *when*, I wish to be guided.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Bisley, Aug. 26, 1856.

As to any Declaration, I am less than ever in a hurry, as I find that I have not the sympathy I expected in the point on which I did more look for it: i.e. Adoration. Such persons (e.g. as Peter Young and Wilson) are alarmed at it. As to Reception by the Wicked, I have been again looking carefully at the sixth of St. John and St. Augustine's Tract upon it, and I cannot get it out of my head that it is at least as strong to negative the eating by the wicked as the passages in St. Paul to affirm it. Dr. Döllinger's remark which you mention seems to me to solve perhaps the difficulty from the *first* clause of v. 57: but not from the *second*. And I have been used to think that our Lord's strong expressions there may be literally taken as describing the *present* condition of a worthy communicant. *If* he die such as he is, he is sure of salvation: like an infant just baptized. The only condition is that of perseverance: which of course is implied in all His promises of salvation. Does *ἔνοχος*, κ.τ.λ. imply more than 'sinning against'? E.g. I find it applied in the Councils to priests administering without receiving. Of course it implies the Real Presence. Nobody, I suppose, stands upon the *word* 'withdrawn,' only the idea is suggested I think by comparing the places. Is there not in St. Thos. Aquinas' Summa a place where he gets out of the difficulty by supposing two distinct 'res Sacramenti'—the Natural and the Mystical Body, and applying St. John vi, or at least St. Augustine's sayings on it, to the *latter* only? I did not think it satisfactory. . . .

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley, 19th S. after Trin. [Sept. 28], 1856.

It is a real trouble to me, first that I cannot yet see this matter as you do, and then that I am afraid of the little difference being known and doing some harm. I will try and tell you as plainly as I can why your explanations do not seem to me conclusive. First, as to our Lord's promises being generally with a tacit condition: I grant they must be very often; but not more so, I think, than St. Paul's or St. John's or the rest: e.g. 'If we suffer we shall also reign with Him'; 'I will never leave thee'; 'whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.' In like manner, 1 Cor. x. 15, for aught I see, may as well be understood with a qualification as St. John vi. 54, &c. The very question between people is, which of the two should be qualified, and I see as yet no clear place of Scripture or consent of Fathers on one side or the other. For a person might be *ἔνοχος*, κ.τ.λ. in other ways besides eating: e.g. by trampling under foot; and 'not discerning,' as far as the literal sense goes, might apply to unbelievers also, or to other profane usage; for does it not mean, 'not making the right distinction between It and common things,' 'counting It an unholy

thing'? And as to Fathers, there are the two strong passages in the Tract on St. John, the one which has been interpreted by Bede, and the other just before it in which it is said that the 'res sacramenti' cannot be received by any to condemnation; also that in De Civit. Dei, where it is said that they who by sin are not in the unity of Christ's Body cannot be truly said to eat and drink, &c.: vid. your Book, pp. 512, 533. And against the numerous places in which Judas, &c., are said to have eaten and drunk, a person might set the Canon (so to call it) in the letter to Boniface quoted by Hooker—that 'Sacraments may be called by the name of the Thing whereof they are Sacraments;' e. g. (he adds) 'the Sacrament of the Body may be called the Body,' pp. 506-7. I am almost afraid to allege this passage, because it seems so capable of being carried too far; still I do not know how I could answer it if it were alleged by an adversary as damaging the argument from St. Augustine. Reverting then to St. John vi. it does seem to me that if there be no plain Scripture, nor Consensus Patrum, nor decree of the Church, to hinder one's doing so, it is natural to take our Lord's words in their literal sense, with the one understood condition of Perseverance, when the promise looks on to the next world. I would not affirm it positively, but I should say it was their probable meaning: I *could* not say as Denison's statement and the R. C.s do, that it is certainly an error. Moreover, this view seems to me to be confirmed by the analogy of Baptism, in which, if I remember right, your book would leave it uncertain what really happens to an adult unworthily receiving; only that it tells on him for the present as a curse and not a blessing. The sum is, that I am ready to go to any extent of protest or appeal from any decision which condemns D., or which does not leave the matter open for the present, which I sincerely believe our Formularies were meant to do: I am not prepared to endorse D.'s doctrinal views. Under these circumstances I should think we might act together, only your protest on that head would be more positive and less hesitating than mine. Do you think that would signify? I am almost in the dark as to what D. is doing. He promises a Paper to-morrow—that which he is to give in on the 1st. I am quite willing to be at hand, if you think best, when the opinion is precipitated, as the chemists say, into a judgment (one would think it was *precipitate* enough already!); or to meet you about it anywhere or when. But I hope we shall see you here this October, though you do not say so; you *did* say so, you know, in your letter before this.

I understood the Bishop of Oxford to say that Sir J. Dodson was to annihilate the quasi-judgment on a ground purely technical, some notice having been wrongly timed. I was in hope that a Prohibition might be obtained in consequence of Lushington having misconstrued the Act of Parliament, by taking no notice of the word 'advisedly'; which, as my authority said, means 'knowing that it is contrary to the Article.' But I cannot hear that such a step is now to be taken.

I saw a note from the Bishop of Sarum to Wilson in which he said he quite agreed with my Paper. Shall I send that Paper to you again, first revising it?

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

[Oct. 3, 1856.]

I should like very much to see your statement¹ again. It seems to me that you hold the one side, as the most probable, while the other seems the more probable to me. You look to one part in Holy Scripture as predominating, I to another. You to St. Augustine's celebrated passages, I to others, as falling in with other Fathers. And so it seems you do not wish me to see as you do; nor am I anxious that you should see the other way, because neither of us think it to be matter of faith.

I quite see the force of your arguments. I did not mean to say particularly that our Lord's promises are to be understood with a condition (though I did say so). I rather meant that all God's promises were. There is therefore (as you too think) no violence done to the text by supplying a condition. Indeed, as you say, *one* condition *must* be supplied, that of perseverance. So it seems to me that there is no additional assumption—I mean, nothing which comes out of one's own mind, nothing arbitrary to suppose, that there is that other condition, common to all God's promises, of the faithfulness of the person receiving, not afterwards only, but at the time also.

On the other side, I should not lay stress on the word *ἐννοχος* (as Denison did), but on the 'not discerning the Lord's Body.' And this made an impression upon me, in that it speaks of His Body, as being present there to receive, up to the very moment of reception. We are not told, I believe, anywhere, that that Presence is withdrawn; and so I suppose it to continue. It would be a miracle if it were *withdrawn*; for what is supernaturally present could only be by a miracle supernaturally withdrawn. But of this miracle we are not told.

Again, as we believe literally 'This is My Body,' it seemed to me more natural that it was His Body by whomsoever received. We are told absolutely that it is His Body, and no conditions are annexed. There seemed to be a difference between an absolute enunciation, such as this is, and a promise, such as those in St. John, because all God's promises in their own nature imply conditions, an absolute enunciation does not.

Then, as to the Fathers, I think that Denison has pressed into his service some who do not express this belief to my mind. Still I should think that [the following do express this belief]—Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Origen, St. Firmilian, Eusebius, St. Athanasius, Council of Alexandria

¹ This statement of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, omitting any reference to the reception by the

wicked, had been sent to Pusey by Keble some time before.

(in S. Ath.), St. Hilary, St. Pacian, St. Ephrem, St. Basil, St. Greg. Nyss. (perhaps St. Greg. Naz. and Euseb. Alex.), St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Jerome of Jerus., St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril Alex., St. Isidore Pelus., St. Maximus of Turin, Theodoret, St. Peter Chrysol., St. Proclus, Sedulius, St. Leo, St. Prosper did. This is a large list. I have just looked over the list, where Denison has quoted from my book, and though I do not think that *all* the passages under these heads prove anything, yet I think that some one passage does distinctly.

On the other hand, St. Augustine, if he is interpreted as denying any participation of the wicked, seems to me at variance, not only with others but with himself. There is, I suppose, a certain amount of presumption that he would not differ from his teacher, St. Ambrose (whom he often reproduces), as well as others. But besides all those passages (as you say) as to Judas, there are a number of others in which St. Augustine speaks just as one would who had no doubt that both good and wicked receive the same Thing. As to Judas, too, he says (as you know) that he received the same Thing as St. Peter or the disciples: 'He allows him to receive among the innocent disciples—our Ransom' (Ep. ad Gor.). 'Of one bread Peter and Judas received, Peter unto life, Judas unto death.'

Again, there are the explicit statements: (a) '*Nor*, because he receives not to salvation, *has he received nothing*. For that was no less the *Body and Blood* of the Lord to whom the Apostle says, He that eateth and drinketh,' de tract. c. Donat. v. § 110. (b) 'What of the very Body and Blood of Christ although the Lord Himself saith, Except a man eat My Flesh, &c., doth not the same Apostle teach us that *this too* becometh hurtful to those who use it ill. For whoso shall eat this bread,' ad Don. post coll. c. 6. (c) 'They too have been brought to the Table of Christ and receive of His Body and Blood,' Ep. 140 ad Honorat. § 66.

(d) 'To the evil the good was a bane, to the good the evil was a boon. Ye remember of *What* it is written, Whoso shall eat, &c. And when the Apostle saith this, the discourse was of those who, treating the Lord's Body like any other food, took it in an indiscriminating way.' (I think that this must be Hom. 50. § 2 of the Homilies on St. John.)

(e) 'We know That which we ourselves receive, and ye who know not yet, will know It by and by; and when ye come to know It, I pray that ye may not receive It to condemnation. For he that eateth and drinketh, &c.' (I think) [in Ps. [98] 99, § 9. T. iv. p. 454, Oxf. Tr.] 'That which is given is not evil, but what is good is given to the evil to damnation.'

Perhaps these passages will look differently, according to a person's previous impression; but those which I have marked *a, b, c*, seem to me very strong.

The question is, then, which set of passages is to be made to fit with the other? I think that Sermon. 254, § 2, p. 1375, gives the key. For

there he speaks of two different modes of eating, but speaks of both as eating that Flesh and Blood.

‘Do so many, in fine, who either in hypocrisy eat that Flesh and drink that Blood, or who, after they have eaten and drunk, become apostate, do they dwell in Christ and Christ in them? Yet assuredly *there is a certain manner of eating that Flesh and drinking that Blood*, in which whosoever eateth and drinketh, he dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him. As, then, he doth not dwell in Christ and Christ in him, who eateth the Flesh and drinketh the Blood of Christ *in any manner whatsoever*.’

In this passage, St. Augustine puts the case of those who eat unworthily at the time, and those who fall away, as one and the same, assuming apparently that none fall away in whom Christ really dwelleth.

(2) He speaks of both as receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, but the one as receiving it, *in a certain manner*, and that these dwell in Christ. And with this agrees the use of the word ‘spiritually,’ which I suspect, in him, does not mean the mode of the Presence, but the character of the receiver—‘Look to it, then, brethren, eat ye *spiritually* the Heavenly Bread.’ (Indeed the Imperative shows that he means something which depends on themselves.)

No one, I suppose, would say that the wicked ‘spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ,’ which Churton says that Denison does.

Do you [think] that Sarum would sign your Protest?

I should think that it would not harm that I should sign your Protest with an addition such as ‘believing moreover that it is most agreeable to Holy Scripture and Primitive antiquity that, although the wicked can in no wise be “partakers of Christ,” nor “spiritually eat His Flesh or drink His Blood,” yet that in the Sacrament they eat and drink unworthily the Body and Blood of Christ, which they do not “discern.”’

I hope that Denison’s answer is carefully drawn up, although he accuses the Archbishop of condemning more than I think that he clearly does condemn, though I fear that he disbelieves it.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Oct. 7, 1856.

I thank you a great many times for the trouble you have taken in sending me that long letter. There is one thing in it that had not occurred to me, and which seems of great consequence: I mean the difference between a statement of fact and a promise in respect of an implied condition. E. g. ‘This child is regenerate’ need not be hypothetical because St. John vi. 54 is so. I own I am much more inclined to Denison’s view than I was.

REV. J. KEBLE TO E. B. P.

Hursley Vicarage, Oct. 8, 1856.

I wish to mention to you one or two things more in reference to yesterday's letter; only do not trouble to write about them: we can speak of them when we meet. 1. Whether 'dwelleth in Me' is not as much as saying *de presenti*, and a quasi-sacramental saying, as 'This is,' &c.; or 'this child is regenerate.' 2. Since we must make *some* supposition in order to reconcile the Fathers with themselves and with Scripture, more than they have directly expressed, why may it not be left open to persons, either (*a*) to supply (with you) the word 'beneficially' in one class of passages, or (*β*) with others to suppose a 'withdrawal' (does this really go beyond the limits of ecclesiastical opinion allowed among us as of old, e.g. on Purgatory?), or (*γ*) to suspend one's judgment altogether, and say, I believe that the Holy Thing is given to the wicked and received by them in their hands: but whether or no they are allowed to eat It I cannot tell. 3. How far would the passage from St. A. in your Book, pp. 506-7, fairly go to reconcile *β* or *γ* with the strong language the other way? 4. Does not such a passage as what you quote, pp. 512-13 and 533-34, justify suspense of belief as to the wicked receiving the Res Sacramenti? (Subordinate to this, may St. Augustine have held, in a way, that there were *two* 'Res Sacramenti'—the *True* Body of our Lord and His *Mystical* Body? Would *that* explain things? See Aquinas, Sum. iii. 60, art. 3; 73, 3 and 6; 80, 4, &c.) I suppose it is a matter of habitual feeling; but as yet I cannot get it out of my head, that the earnest repetition, in so many different forms, of the present effect of eating, in St. John vi, perhaps takes the passage out of the range of ordinary hypothetical promises. 5. Is there not ground for a distinction between 'receiving' and 'eating,' from the very words of Institution?

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Oct. 10, 1856.

. . . Is not the ground [of our saying] that the declaration 'This child *is* regenerate,' is not conditional, this, that since the child is incapable of choice, the act is wholly that of Almighty God? In the case of the adult, I suppose that it would be hypothetical, the effects of the Sacrament being suspended in the case of the unworthy receiver, who (as St. Augustine says) only receive 'the mark of the deserter.' May it not account for the emphatic repetition, as well as for the use of the present in St. John, that our Lord would impress upon us the actuality of His Gift to us, not that we *shall* have, but that we already have Life within us, because we have Him Who is our Life? It is a present indwelling of Life, the beginning of Life everlasting.

I quite agree with you in thinking the belief of a withdrawal allow-

able, only I do not think it probable (1) because it would be a miraculous dispensation of which Holy Scripture tells us nothing: (2) the passage of Holy Scripture which speaks on the case of those who receive unworthily, rather implies that It is not withdrawn. I mean that but for any other passage of Scripture we should have so interpreted it, I suppose, without doubt; and should we not rather look to a passage in which the wicked are spoken of, *for their case*, rather than one (like St. John vi.) where the good are spoken of?

Have you quite considered that those two or three passages of St. Augustine stand alone, against passages of his, and that he has no other Father (I believe) with him, whereas there are so many seemingly against him?

Strange as is the belief which St. Augustine condemns rightly (de Civ. D., quoted p. 532), it still implies a *common* belief that the wicked did receive the Body and Blood of Christ, though the inference was, of course, shocking.

E. B. P. TO REV. J. KEBLE.

Oct. 16, 1856.

On the other question about the wicked, it is the more sad, because I see no possibility (as things now are) that we can adopt one Formula. For since the Archbishop condemns what I believe (though not as matter of faith) as contrary to the meaning of the Articles, I feel that I have no choice honestly, but that of saying what I do believe, and running the risk, or resigning my office, which I hold by virtue of my subscription. Of course I could remain silent, until the issue: but when the issue *is* come, if it should be unfavourable, it would be too late.

With regard to St. Augustine on the participation by the wicked, I have looked again over the passages, and hope to be able to talk it over with you on Friday, but had rather set down something because I can put what I mean more clearly than in speaking.

Surely the passage in the Ep. ad Bonifac. has been pressed wrongly. St. Aug. is asked (you know) how children can be said to believe, and he says to believe is to 'have faith'; but since they cannot, in their age, have 'faith,' the 'Sacrament of faith' is to them for faith. And so he says the other Sacrament, the whole Sacrament, the outward and inward part, are called by the name of the inward. But he would not say that the outward part would be called by the name of the inward, where the inward part could be, yet was not. An adult who came to the Sacrament of Baptism, without faith, would not be said to have faith because he received the Sacrament of faith. He is not (you remember) speaking or alluding to the case of the wicked; but, at most, he says that the outward part is called after the inward, the sign by the name [of] the thing signified. He does not say 'by the name of the thing signified, being *absent*.' For this would contradict his own belief, and relate to the whole doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

The other places involve (as you will I think observe) a very strong doctrine of final perseverance. He seems to suppose that no one ever received Christ in his soul in the Holy Eucharist, so as to dwell in Christ and Christ in him, who finally fell away. Observe the test which he gives, p. 513 'if he cleaveth, then he be not abandoned,' and p. 525 he puts together those who either in hypocrisy eat that Flesh and drink that Blood, *or who after they have eaten become apostate*—do they dwell in Christ and Christ in them? He twice, in this place, speaks of these wicked as eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, and then distinguishes 'those who eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of Christ *in any manner whatsoever*,' and those who do so '*in some certain manner*.' So that he supposes that there are two ways of 'eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ,' both of whom he speaks of here as really eating that Flesh and drinking that Blood.

Now Bede, who supplies the word 'spiritualiter' in the passage on St. John (p. 512), was (as you know) very well read in St. Augustine; so that on the Gospels where St. Augustine has been lost, he is supposed to represent St. Augustine's meaning.

St. Augustine, too, uses the word 'spiritually' in this same sense (527).

Bede, then, I think, rightly supposes that St. Augustine, when he denied of the wicked that they 'eat His Flesh and drink His Blood,' meant to deny that they 'ate it spiritually,' i.e. with their souls, whereas others ate It only with their bodies.

This would make St. Augustine consistent with himself, and with the rest of the Fathers. But then, you only half agree with St. Augustine as to those passages of his which you adopt as keys to the rest. For he supposes that none really receive in their souls the Body and Blood of Christ who do not persevere to the end.

If, on the other hand, we suppose (as I do) that St. Augustine means by not eating the Body and Blood of Christ, that such do not eat It spiritually, his meaning would come to the same as our Article, 'are not in any wise partakers of Christ,' which of course the wicked are not.

'Friday' is now to-morrow¹. I enclose a letter of Denison's. It seems by this that we are to have a respite for a few days. I will try to come again for two half-days, between my Lectures.

I have sent the enclosed to friends in order to ascertain what their feeling is, and also thinking that we must be prepared by Tuesday next.

Dean Fortescue tells me that Manning or H. Wilberforce had told him that they knew of the names of numbers of our people who would join Rome as soon as the decision is known.

I should rather like on Saturday to go and see the Bishop of Salisbury if he is there.

¹ This letter being continued into the early hours of Thursday, Oct. 16.

SHORT ACCOUNT OF PUSEY'S WORK 'ON THE PRESENCE OF
CHRIST IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.'

In his second sermon on the Holy Eucharist, Pusey had stated it to be the belief of the Church of England that in the duly consecrated Sacrament we receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ 'under the form of bread and wine'.¹ This significant phrase occurs in the authoritative announcement of subjects to be handled in the Second Book of Homilies, which is placed at the end of the First Book.² Mr. Goode had contended that the 'advertisement' at the end of the First Book formed no part of the Homilies; that it was repeated by the printers in successive editions; and that the phrase quoted by Pusey had been intended by Cranmer to express the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which he held at the time of writing it. There was so much plausibility about this contention that Pusey determined to deal with it thoroughly; especially as it had been incorporated with his argument by Mr. Ditcher's counsel in the proceedings at Bath.³ Perhaps nowhere else does he show his thoroughness as a controversial writer more strikingly than in the 156 pages which he devotes to a vindication of his use of this single phrase. The so-called 'advertisement' was not repeated through any printer's error, but because it had been chosen in order to express, and was continued as expressing, the belief of the Church of England. And that the phrase 'under the form of bread and wine' does not imply Transubstantiation, is shown from the history of its introduction into the Homilies. It had been imported, under Cranmer's influence, from the Confession of Augsburg into the Articles of 1536 and the Institution of a Christian Man. When in his later years Henry VIII. insisted more peremptorily on the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the phrase had been dropped. It was resumed in 1547 in the First Book of Homilies after Henry's death, by Cranmer, who in the following year stated that for many years before 1547 he had ceased to believe in Transubstantiation, although he did then still believe in the Real Presence. The phrase had been deliberately chosen in order to describe the subject of which its author proposed to treat; and it had a recognized theological value, as maintaining at once the Objective Presence, and the continuance of the consecrated elements in their natural substances. The second division of the book is a very careful analysis of the exact language of the Church Catechism, the Communion Service, and the XXXIX Articles and the Rubrics on the subject of the Real Presence.

Each expression that bears upon the doctrine is brought out into relief and illuminated by thought and learning. In the Catechism, the account of the inward part of the Sacrament, and the distinction between It, and the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby; in the Com-

¹ 'Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist,' p. 22.

Griffith. Oxford, 1859, p. 147.

² 'Two Books of Homilies,' ed.

³ 'Real Presence in the English Church,' pp. 159, 160.

munion Office, the statement in the exhortation that God has given His Son to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in* the Holy Sacrament, and the interpretation of our Lord's words in St. John vi. 53, 54, as realized in the Holy Communion: '*then* we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood'; the strong language of the Prayer of Humble Access; the import of the Act of Consecration, and of the Words of Administration; the vivid expressions of the second and alternative prayer after the Communion, are successively insisted on. It is observable that the language on which Pusey lays most store as teaching the doctrine of the Real Presence dates from the Reformation; and this enables him to insist with the more confidence that the Articles are to be interpreted by the Prayer-book—the language which we use about God's gifts and ordinances by the language which we presume to address to Him. Pusey lays great and legitimate stress on the drift of the revision of the Articles of 1552 by the Elizabethan divines, under the influence of Parker: he observes that the rejection of Transubstantiation relates simply to the continuance of the natural substances of the consecrated Elements. He points out the real force of the statement that the Body of Christ is 'given,' and 'taken,' as well as 'eaten,' in the Holy Supper; and then he addresses himself to the task of showing that a purely spiritual Presence is yet Objective and Real, from the use of the word spiritual at the time of the Reformation, both generally and in the English Formularies.

Mr. Goode, of course, had made much of the so-called Black Rubric at the end of the Communion Service. Pusey points out that this Declaration in our present Prayer-book only denies the corporal Presence of Christ's Body, i. e. a presence after the manner of a natural body. It is in striking contrast to the Declaration of 1552, which was inserted by the King's authority,—never accepted by the Church, and struck out in 1559,—whereby the 'Real and Essential Presence' of Christ in the Eucharist was rejected. This unscriptural negation the Revisers of 1662 had deliberately rejected when, in order to conciliate the Puritans, they accepted the rest of the Declaration; and thus the history of this document affords a witness to the faith of the Church of England in the Real Presence. Passing to the discussion of the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the wicked, Pusey first exposes the popular error which makes the phrase *ex opere operato* mean that 'men are justified by a ceremony without any good motion of the heart,' instead of its true meaning, which is that in the Sacraments God bestows grace on the receiver, beyond the receiver's deserts or dispositions, and in virtue of the 'work wrought' by Christ. Pusey then passes in review the Articles which bear on the subject of the reception of the wicked; and asserts that what they really deny is that the wicked receive Christ in the Eucharist, to any spiritual advantage whatever. That the wicked do receive Christ sacramentally is attested by the first and the last exhortations in the Communion

Service : the language of which would be grossly exaggerated unless the unworthy recipient were guilty of receiving without moral and spiritual discernment the Body and Blood of Christ. The position is further supported by an elaborate examination of all the passages of St. Augustine which bear on the subject, the general consent of the Fathers, and, above all, the language of Holy Scripture.

The last section of the book, on the Adoration of Christ present in the Sacrament, is less complete and more technical than Keble's work on the same subject. Like Keble, Pusey bases himself on Bishop Andrewes' principle that 'Christ Himself the substance of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, out of and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be adored¹.' The adoration of Christ in the Eucharist was the necessary corollary of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist ; but this adoration could not without idolatry be directed to the Eucharistic elements, remaining as they do in their natural substances. The 'receive' of our formularies upon the subject is accounted for by the desire of the compilers of the Prayer-book to restore to its due prominence the duty and privilege of Communion ; while the Article only states that Christ did not ordain the Sacrament in order that It should be adored, and the Declaration at the end of the Communion Service is not directed against the worship of our Lord anywhere, but only against a particular conception of the mode of His Presence as that of a natural body which the Puritans mistakenly associated with the practice of kneeling when receiving the Holy Communion.

APPENDIX.

The Tracts for the Times.

VOLUME I.¹

Tract	1833.	
I.	Sept. 9.	THOUGHTS ON THE MINISTERIAL COMMISSION. 4 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> [J. H. NEWMAN].
II.	Sept. 9.	THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. 4 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
III.	Sept. 9.	THOUGHTS RESPECTFULLY ADDRESSED TO THE CLERGY ON ALTERATIONS IN THE LITURGY. THE BURIAL SERVICE. THE PRINCIPLE OF UNITY. 8 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
IV.	Sept. 21.	ADHERENCE TO THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION THE SAFEST COURSE. ON ALTERATIONS IN THE PRAYER-BOOK. 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [J. KEBLE].
V.	Oct. 18.	A SHORT ADDRESS TO HIS BRETHREN ON THE NATURE AND CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, AND OF THE BRANCH OF IT ESTABLISHED IN ENGLAND. By a Layman. 15 pp. [J. W. BOWDEN].
VI.	Oct. 29.	THE PRESENT OBLIGATION OF PRIMITIVE PRACTICE. A SIN OF THE CHURCH. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
VII.	Oct. 29.	THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH APOSTOLICAL. 4 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
VIII.	Oct. 31.	THE GOSPEL A LAW OF LIBERTY. CHURCH REFORM. 4 pp. . . . [J. H. NEWMAN].
IX.	Oct. 31.	ON SHORTENING THE CHURCH SERVICES. SUNDAY LESSONS. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [R. H. FROUDE].

¹ It was intended that each volume should contain the Tracts issued in an Academical year.

Tract		1833.
x.	Nov. 4.	HEADS OF A WEEK-DAY LECTURE, delivered to a Country Congregation. 6 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
xi.	Nov. 11.	THE VISIBLE CHURCH. Letters I and II. 8 pp., <i>Ad Scholas</i> [J. H. NEWMAN].
xii.	Dec. 4.	RICHARD NELSON. No. I. BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND DEACONS. 16 pp. . . . [THOS. KEBLE].
xiii.	Dec. 5.	SUNDAY LESSONS. THE PRINCIPLE OF SELECTION. 11 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> [J. KEBLE].
xiv.	Dec. 12.	THE EMBER DAYS. 7 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [ALFRED MENZIES].
xv.	Dec. 13.	ON THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. 11 pp. [W. PALMER, revised and completed by J. H. NEWMAN].
xvi.	Dec. 17.	ADVENT. 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [B. HARRISON].
xvii.	Dec. 20.	THE MINISTERIAL COMMISSION: A TRUST FROM CHRIST FOR THE BENEFIT OF HIS PEOPLE. 7 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . . . [B. HARRISON].
xviii.	Dec. 21.	THOUGHTS ON THE BENEFITS OF THE SYSTEM OF FASTING ENJOINED BY OUR CHURCH. 28 pp. [E. B. PUSEY].
xix.	Dec. 23.	ON ARGUING CONCERNING THE APOSTOLICAL SUC- CESSION. ON RELUCTANCE TO CONFESS THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. 4 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
xx.	Dec. 24.	THE VISIBLE CHURCH. Letter III. 4 pp., <i>Ad</i> <i>Scholas</i> [J. H. NEWMAN].
		1834.
xxi.	Jan. 1.	MORTIFICATION OF THE FLESH A SCRIPTURE DUTY. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . . [J. H. NEWMAN].
xxii.	Jan. 6.	RICHARD NELSON. No. II. THE ATHANASIAN CREED. 18 pp. [THOS. KEBLE].
xxiii.	Jan. 6.	THE FAITH AND OBEDIENCE OF CHURCHMEN THE STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH. 4 pp. [A. P. PERCEVAL].
xxiv.	Jan. 25.	THE SCRIPTURE VIEW OF THE APOSTOLIC COMMIS- SION. 11 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [B. HARRISON].

Tract	1834.	
xxv.	Jan. 25.	THE GREAT NECESSITY AND ADVANTAGE OF PUBLIC PRAYER (extracted from BISHOP BEVERIDGE'S Sermon on the subject). 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
xxvi.	Feb. 2.	THE NECESSITY AND ADVANTAGE OF FREQUENT COMMUNION (extracted from BISHOP BEVERIDGE'S Sermon on the subject). 23 pp. A reprint.
xxvii.	Feb. 24.	THE HISTORY OF POPISH TRANSUBSTANTIATION (by JOHN COSIN, Bishop of Durham). 16 pp. A reprint.
xxviii.	Mar. 25.	The same, concluded. 24 pp.
xxix.	Mar. 25.	CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, OR, WHY SHOULD WE BELONG TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND? By a Layman. 11 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [J. W. BOWDEN].
xxx.	Mar. 25.	The same, continued. 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [J. W. BOWDEN].
xxxi.	Apr. 25.	THE REFORMED CHURCH. 4 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
xxxii.	Apr. 25.	THE STANDING ORDINANCES OF RELIGION. 8 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> [C. P. EDEN].
xxxiii.	May 1.	PRIMITIVE EPISCOPACY. 7 pp., <i>Ad Scholas</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
xxxiv.	May 1.	rites and CUSTOMS OF THE CHURCH. 8 pp., <i>Ad Scholas</i> [J. H. NEWMAN].
xxxv.	May 8.	THE PEOPLE'S INTEREST IN THEIR MINISTER'S COMMISSION. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [A. P. PERCEVAL].
xxxvi.	June 11.	ACCOUNT OF RELIGIOUS SECTS AT PRESENT EXISTING IN ENGLAND. 7 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [A. P. PERCEVAL].
xxxvii.	June 24.	BISHOP WILSON'S FORM OF EXCOMMUNICATION. 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
xxxviii.	July 25.	VIA MEDIA. No. I. 12 pp., <i>Ad Scholas</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
xxxix.	July 25.	BISHOP WILSON'S FORM OF RECEIVING PENITENTS. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.

Tract		1834.
XL.	July 25.	RICHARD NELSON. No. III. ON BAPTISM. 15 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> [JOHN KEBLE].
XLI.	Aug. 24.	VIA MEDIA. No. II. 12 pp., <i>Ad Scholas</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
XLII.	Aug. 24.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. I, Sunday. 15 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
XLIII.	Sept. 21.	RICHARD NELSON. No. IV. LENGTH OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE. 16 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [THOS. KEBLE].
XLIV.	Sept. 29.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. II, Monday. 4 pp. (2nd ed. 8 pp.), <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
XLV.	Oct. 18.	THE GROUNDS OF OUR FAITH. 6 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
XLVI.	Oct. 28.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. III, Tuesday. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
XLVII.	Nov. 1.	THE VISIBLE CHURCH. Letter IV. 4 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> [J. H. NEWMAN].
VOLUME II.		
XLVIII.	Nov. 30.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. IV, Wednesday. 4 pp. (2nd ed. 10 pp.), <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
XLIX.	Dec. 25.	THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. 12 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [B. HARRISON].
L.	Dec. 26.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. IV, Wednesday (<i>continued</i>). 4 pp. (2nd ed. 7 pp.), <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
1835.		
LI.	Jan. 6.	ON DISSENT WITHOUT REASON IN CONSCIENCE. 16 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . . . [R. F. WILSON].
LII.	Undated.	SERMONS FOR SAINTS' DAYS AND HOLIDAYS. No. I, St. Matthias. 8 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [J. KEBLE].
LIII.	Feb. 24.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. V, Thursday. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.

Tract	1835.	
LIV.	Feb. 2.	SERMONS FOR SAINTS' DAYS AND HOLIDAYS. No. II, The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. 12 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [J. KEBLE].
LV.	Mar. 25.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. V, Thursday (<i>continued</i>). 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
LVI.	Mar. 25.	HOLY DAYS OBSERVED IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. 7 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . . [J. W. BOWDEN].
LVII.	Mar. 25.	SERMONS FOR SAINTS' DAYS AND HOLIDAYS. No. III, St. Mark's Day. 15 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> [J. KEBLE].
LVIII.	April 19.	ON THE CHURCH AS VIEWED BY FAITH AND BY THE WORLD. 7 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . [J. W. BOWDEN].
LIX.	April 25.	THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN ENGLAND, RELATIVELY TO THE STATE AND THE NATION. 8 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [R. H. FROUDE].
LX.	Mar. 25.	SERMONS FOR SAINTS' DAYS AND HOLIDAYS. No. IV, St. Philip and St. James. 12 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> [J. KEBLE].
LXI.	May 1.	THE CATHOLIC CHURCH A WITNESS AGAINST ILLIBERALITY. 4 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [A. BULLER].
LXII.	May 1.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. V, Thursday (<i>continued</i>). 8 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
LXIII.	May 1.	THE ANTIQUITY OF THE EXISTING LITURGIES. 16 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . . [R. H. FROUDE].
LXIV.	June 11.	BISHOP BULL ON THE ANCIENT LITURGIES. 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint.
LXV.	June 29.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. VI, Friday (abridged). 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint. After the first edition, No. 65 is a tract of 32 pages, containing the unabridged form

Tract	1835.	
		of Bishop Wilson's Meditations for Friday and Saturday. See No. 70.
LXVI.	July 25.	ON THE BENEFITS OF THE SYSTEM OF FASTING PRESCRIBED BY OUR CHURCH. Supplement to Tract 18. 16 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [E. B. PUSEY].
LXVII.	Aug. 24.	SCRIPTURAL VIEWS OF HOLY BAPTISM. pp. 1-48, <i>Ad Clerum</i> . For a description of the later editions of this tract, see vol. i. pp. 352-354. [E. B. PUSEY].
LXVIII.	Sept. 29.	SCRIPTURAL VIEWS OF HOLY BAPTISM (<i>continued</i>), pp. 49-104, <i>Ad Clerum</i> . . [E. B. PUSEY].
LXIX.	Oct. 18.	SCRIPTURAL VIEWS OF HOLY BAPTISM (<i>concluded</i>). pp. 105-208, <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [E. B. PUSEY].
LXX.	Oct. 28.	BISHOP WILSON'S MEDITATIONS ON HIS SACRED OFFICE. No. VII, Saturday (abridged). 4 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> . A reprint. After the first edition, the unabridged form of Bishop Wilson's Meditations for Saturday is printed as part of No. 65; and the 'Notes to the Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism' (Tracts 67, 68 and 69), pp. 209-295 [E. B. PUSEY], are reckoned as No. 70.

1836.

VOLUME III.

LXXI.	Jan. 1.	ON THE CONTROVERSY WITH THE ROMANISTS (No. I, Against Romanism), 35 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> [J. H. NEWMAN].
LXXII.	Jan. 6.	ARCHBISHOP USSHER ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD (No. II, Against Romanism). 60 pp. A reprint.
LXXIII.	Feb. 2.	ON THE INTRODUCTION OF RATIONALISTIC PRINCIPLES INTO RELIGION. 56 pp., <i>Ad Scholas</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
LXXIV.	Apr. 25.	CATENA PATRUM. No. I. Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the doctrine

Tract	1836.	of the Apostolical Succession. 56 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> [J. H. NEWMAN ¹]. Printed also simultaneously as the Appendix to E. B. Pusey's 'Earnest Remonstrance to the Author of "The Pope's Letter," &c.' See Tract 77.
LXXV.	June 24.	ON THE ROMAN BREVARY AS EMBODYING THE SUBSTANCE OF THE DEVOTIONAL SERVICES OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC. 148 pp. (2nd ed. 207 pp.), <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
LXXVI.	Sept. 29.	CATENA PATRUM. No. II. Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. 56 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
LXXVII.	Nov. 1.	AN EARNEST REMONSTRANCE TO THE AUTHOR OF 'THE POPE'S LETTER.' 35 pp. A reprint. First issued on April 25, 1836. [E. B. PUSEY].
	1837.	VOLUME IV.
LXXVIII.	Feb 2.	CATENA PATRUM. No. III. Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the duty of maintaining, <i>Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est</i> . 118 pp., <i>Ad Populum</i> [H. E. MANNING and C. MARRIOTT].
LXXIX.	Mar. 25.	ON PURGATORY (Against Romanism, No. III). 61 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> . [J. H. NEWMAN].
LXXX.	Undated.	ON RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, Parts I-III, 82 pp. [I. WILLIAMS].
LXXXI.	Nov. 1.	CATENA PATRUM. No. IV. Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, with an historical account of the changes made in the Liturgy as to the expression of that doctrine. 415 pp. (2nd ed. 424 pp.). [E. B. PUSEY].

¹ Sometimes attributed to B. Harrison.

Tract LXXXII.	1837. Nov. 1.	THE PREFACE, TITLE-PAGE, AND CONTENTS TO VOLUME IV. The Preface includes 'Letter to a Magazine on the subject of Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism.' 42 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
VOLUME V.		
LXXXIII.	1838. June 29.	ADVENT SERMONS ON ANTICHRIST. 54 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
LXXXIV.	Aug. 24.	WHETHER A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BE NOW BOUND TO HAVE MORNING AND EVENING PRAYERS DAILY IN HIS PARISH CHURCH. 45 pp. [THOS. KEBLE, conclusion from p. 35 by G. PREVOST].
LXXXV.	Sept. 21.	LECTURES ON THE SCRIPTURE PROOF OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH. Part I. 115 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
1839.		
LXXXVI.	Mar. 25.	INDICATIONS OF A SUPERINTENDING PROVIDENCE IN THE PRESERVATION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK AND IN THE CHANGES WHICH IT HAS UNDERGONE. 100 pp. . . [I. WILLIAMS].
1840.		
LXXXVII.	Feb. 2.	ON RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE (<i>conclusion</i>). 144 pp., <i>Ad Clerum</i> [I. WILLIAMS].
LXXXVIII.	Mar. 25.	THE GREEK DEVOTIONS OF BISHOP ANDREWS, translated and arranged. 96 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].
END OF VOLUME V.		
LXXXIX.	Undated.	ON THE MYSTICISM ATTRIBUTED TO THE EARLY FATHERS OF THE CHURCH. 186 pp. [J. KEBLE].
1841.		
XC.	Jan. 25.	REMARKS ON CERTAIN PASSAGES IN THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES. 83 pp. [J. H. NEWMAN].

INDEX TO VOL. III

A.

- Acland, Mr. (afterwards Sir T. D.), pp. 13, 175, 198.
 Acland, Dr. (Sir H. W.), 411, 413.
 Addams, Dr., 161.
 Allies, Rev. T. W., 257, 261, 265, 267-269, 279, 287, 297.
 Ambrose, St., treatise on Virginitv, 4 n.
 Andrewes, Bp., 3, 97, 439.
 Argyll, Bp. of, 449.
 Argyll, Duchess of, 373, 374.
 Armstrong, Rev. J. (afterwards Bp. of Grahamstown), 370.
 Arnold, Dr., 158.
 Auckland, Lord (Bp. of Bath and Wells), 434.
 Augustine, St., 2, 97, 119, 439; Preface to Exposition of the Psalms, cited, 421.
 Awdry, Sir J., 89.

B.

- Badeley, Mr., 165, 166, 178, 180, 205, 206, 241.
 Bagot, Bp. of Bath and Wells, 33, 248, 427.
 Baker, Rev. Arthur, 352, 375, 376.
 Barter, Rev. W. B., 273, 274.
 Bartholomew, Rev. C. C., 441.
 Basil, St., 177.
 Beckett, Rev. H. F., 356, 361, 365.
 Bennett, Rev. W. J. E., 241, 279, 366, 374, 375, 441.
 Beresford-Hope, A. J., 191, 248, 280, 352, 366.
 Biber, Dr., 276, 280.
 Binney, Mr. T., 179.

- Blomfield, Bp., 13, 22, 205, 220, 247, 294, 302, 303.
 Boyle, Hon. G. F., 170 n.
 Brine, Rev. J. G., 411.
 Bristol Church Union, 274, 278-280.
Bristol Times, extract from, 138-141.
British Critic, the, 36, 176.
British Magazine, the, 177.
 Brougham, Lord, 250.
 Browne, Rev. E. G. K., 147, 148.
 Bruce, Miss Mary (Sister Mary), 17, 186.
 Bunsen, Chevalier, 39.
 Bunyan, John, 97.
 Burgon, Dean, 'Lives of Twelve Good Men,' cited, 420.
 Burritt, Elihu, 170 n.
 Butler, Rev. W., 155, 371.

C.

- Camden, Lord, 13.
 Canterbury, Missionary College of St. Augustine at, 87.
 Cardwell, Mr. Edward, 173.
 Cardwell, Prof., 404.
 Carter, Rev. T. T., 441.
 Carus, 'Memoir of Charles Simeon,' cited, 98.
 Cavendish, Mr. (afterwards Lord Richard), 241, 288.
 Chrysostom, St., 119.
 Church, Rev. R. W. (afterwards Dean of St. Paul's), 77.
 'Church of England, the, leaves her children free,' by E. B. P., 269.
Church Porch, the, 374.
 Churton, Archdeacon, 134, 137, 159.

'Clergy Proceedings Bill,' 220.
 Clevedon Commission, 433, 434.
 Clive, Lord, 13.
 Coleridge, Mr. Justice (Sir John), 89,
 165, 395, 456.
 Coleridge, Mr. J. D., 401.
 'Collegiate and Professorial Teaching,' by E. B. P., 387-390.
 Commentary on the Bible, 149-152,
 157.
 Commentary on the Minor Prophets,
 154.
 Commission to inquire into state, &c.
 of the University, 380, 391.
 Conington, Prof., 387.
 Convocation, revival of, 352.
 Copeland, Rev. W. J., 51, 59, 141,
 155, 410, 431.
 Corn Laws, Bill for repeal of, 171.
 Cotton, Dr. (Provost of Worcester), 79.
 'Councils of the Church, the,' by
 E. B. P., 353, 354.
 Crawley, Mr. and Mrs. (of Littlemore),
 186.
 Crawley, Rev. George, 356, 359, 362,
 364.
 Cyprian, St., 267.
 Cyril, St., of Alexandria, 458.

D.

Dampier, J. L., 380.
 Daubeny, Prof., 404.
 Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, 176.
 Denison, Archdeacon, 241, 280, 427,
 438, 445, 446.
 Denison, Bp., 313.
 Denman, Lord, 165.
 Derby, Earl of (Chancellor of the Uni-
 versity), 400, 403.
 Devonport, Miss Sellon's work at,
 192, 194, 195, 199; Printing Press
 at, 372.
 Dickenson, Mr. F. H., 352.
 Dickinson, Mr., 13.
 Diocesan Synod (Exeter), 226.
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 403.
 Dissenters, admission of, to the Uni-
 versity, 400, 401, 406, 407.
 Ditcher, Rev. J., 427, 428, 429, 446.
 Dodson, Sir John, 445.
 Dodsworth, Rev. W., 13, 17, 23, 163,
 241, 261, 265, 270, 279, 292, 295,
 297, 301-303.
 Donkin, Prof., 404.
 Dufferin, Lord, 170 n.

E.

Edinburgh, Bp. of, 449, 457.
 Ellacombe, Rev. H. T., 14.

Ellacombe, Miss Jane (Sister Anne),
 17.
English Churchman, the, 53.
 Erle, Mr. Justice, 165.
 Estcourt, Mr., 173.
 'Everlasting Punishment, What is of
 Faith,' by E. B. P., cited, 416.

F.

Feilding, Lord (afterwards Lord Den-
 bigh), 248.
 Ferrar, Nicholas, 3.
 'Final Appeal in Matters of Faith,'
 by Dr. Wiseman, cited, 239.
 Final Court of Appeal, letters by
 E. B. P. and Mr. Justice Coleridge,
 211, 213.
 Forbes, Lord, 280.
 Forbes, Rev. A. P. (afterwards Bp. of
 Brechin), 133, 344, 348, 355, 439,
 448-459.
 Forbes, Rev. G., 149.
 Founders, intentions of, 401, 402.
 Francis, St., of Assisi, 90, 97.
 Francis, St., of Sales, 97.
 Fust, Sir Herbert Jenner (Dean of
 Arches), 202, 234.

G.

Gaisford, Dr. (Dean of Ch. Ch.), 404,
 418.
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., 13, 71,
 72, 82, 84-86, 89, 144, 146, 147,
 168, 173, 174-6, 180, 181, 321,
 323, 324, 344, 346, 347, 348, 396-
 398, 400, 409, 413, 456.
 Gobat, Bp., 71, 76, 78.
 Golightly, Rev. C. P., 53.
 Goode, Rev. W., 230, 231.
 Gordon, Rev. Osborne, 404, 405.
 Gorham, Rev. G. C., case of, 201-
 237; pamphlet on, by Rev. W.
 Dodsworth, 261.
 Greenhill, Mr. W., 7.
 Gresley, Rev. W., 78.
 Grueber, Rev. C. S., 441.
Guardian, the, 60, 150, 231, 262,
 272, 407, 430.
 Gutch, Rev. C., 365.

H.

Hamilton, Rev. W. K. (afterwards
 Bp. of Salisbury), 260, 370.
 Hampden, Dr., 158-162, 164.
 Harcourt, Abp., 158.
 Harding, Dr., 161.

Harington, Dr. (Principal of Brasenose), 245.
 Harrison, Rev. B. (afterwards Archdeacon of Maidstone), 9, 68, 72, 76, 177, 204.
 Hawkins, Dr. (Provost of Oriel), 162, 404, 405.
 Hayling Island, 175, 186, 187.
 Heathcote, Rev. W. B., 441.
 Hebdomadal Board, 84, 378, 380, 381, 391, 392, 393, 399.
 — Report and Evidence before Committee of, cited, 382–386, 394.
 Hebdomadal Council, the new, 404–408, 412.
 Heckler, Professor, 'The Jerusalem Bishopric,' cited, 71 *n*.
 Henderson, Rev. T., 441.
 Hetling, Rev. G. H., 200.
 Heurtley, Rev. Dr., 434.
 Heywood, Mr., 398–400.
 Hickley, Mr., 133.
 Hinds, Dr., Bp. of Norwich, 380.
 Hoare, Mr. Henry, 280, 343.
 'Holy Rood,' printing by women at, 372.
 Hook, Rev. W. F. (afterwards Dean of Chichester), 7, 9, 112–136, 367, 368.
 Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, 3.
 Hope, Mr. J. R., 240, 241, 276.
 Horfield, Pusey preaches at, 138.
 Howley, Abp., 177, 390.
 Hubbard, J. G. (afterwards Lord Adington), 248.
 Hughes, Miss Marian, 10–12.
 Huntingford, Rev. H., 164.
 Huntingford, Mrs., 186, 187.
 Hussey, Prof., 404.

I.

Inglis, Sir R. H., 173, 175, 178.
 Irish Church Question, 172.
 Irish Famine, fast-day for, 169, 170.

J.

Jacobson, Dr., 404.
 Jelf, Dr., 64, 65.
 Jenkyns, Dr. (Master of Balliol), 174.
 Jerome, St., 2, 439.
 Jeune, Dr. (Master of Pembroke), 101, 102, 380, 404, 405.
 Jewish Disabilities Bill, 175.
 Johnson, Very Rev. G. S. (Dean of Wells), 380, 434.

Judicial Committee of Privy Council, 228, 229, 232, 233, 238, 459.
 Jurisdiction, Ecclesiastical, letter by E. B. P. on, 209.

K.

Kay, Rev. Dr., 155.
 Keble, Rev. J., 34, 88, 95, 99, 104, 108, 133, 151, 153, 155, 156, 159–161, 169, 189, 217, 225, 241, 246, 249, 255, 265, 274–278, 280, 282, 292, 307, 310, 311, 313, 314, 342, 343, 351, 352, 358, 393, 394, 400, 424, 428–431, 434, 436, 438, 439, 441–443, 445, 446, 449, 453, 454.
 — Biography of, by Rev. W. Lock, 97.
 — Memoir of, by Sir J. T. Coleridge, 401.
 — 'A few plain thoughts on the admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford,' 400, 401.
 — 'On Eucharistical Adoration,' 446, 449.
 Kilpack, Rev. J. (of Stoke Damerel), 192.
 Knight Bruce (Vice-Chancellor of Judicial Committee of Privy Council), 228.
 Knott, Rev. J. W., 366.

L.

Langston, Miss, 17.
 Laud, Abp., 3.
 Law, 'Serious Call,' 3, 4.
 Lee, Dr. Prince (Bp. of Manchester), 159.
 Leeds, St. Saviour's, 112–136, 355–368.
 'Letter on the Proposed Change in the Laws prohibiting Marriage between those near of Kin,' by E. B. P., 177.

LETTERS:—

Acland, T. D., to E. B. P., 198.
 Badeley, E., to E. B. P., 160, 161, 165, 205.
 Blomfield, Bp., to E. B. P., 295.
 Canterbury, Abp. of, to Archdeacon Denison, 430.
 Churton, Archdeacon, to E. B. P., 69.
 Coleridge, Mr. Justice, to E. B. P., 213, 395, 456.
 Dodsworth, Mr., to E. B. P., 23.
 Ellacombe, Miss J. J., to her Father, 27.
 Fletcher, Mrs., 414.

LETTERS (*continued*):—

- Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., to E. B. P., 397, 400.
 Hamilton, Rev. W. K., to E. B. P., 200.
 Hetling, Rev. G., to Bp. of Exeter, 200.
 Hook, Rev. Dr. W. F., to E. B. P., 7, 9, 114, 119-123, 125-129, 131, 132.
 Huntingford, Mrs. G., 186-187.
 Keble, Rev. J., to Bp. Forbes, 451.
 — to E. B. P., 50, 58, 88, 91, 100, 108, 151, 152, 161, 163, 189, 217, 219, 223, 226, 245, 265, 266, 276, 278-280, 288, 289, 294, 308, 310, 311, 314, 318, 320, 322, 324, 325, 327, 345, 352, 357, 358, 421, 429, 433, 435, 442, 450, 461-463, 466, 467.
 — to Bp. Sumner, 283.
 — to Bp. Wilberforce, 315, 317.
 Manning, Archdeacon, to E. B. P., 51, 53, 135, 153.
 Marriott, Rev. C., to E. B. P., 49.
 — to Bp. Selwyn, 82.
 Minster, Rev. Thomas, to E. B. P., 356, 357.
 Mozley, Rev. J. B., to E. B. P., 54.
 Newman, Rev. J. H., to J. W. Bowden, 6.
 — to Miss Giberne, 10.
 — to E. B. P., 394.
 Phillpotts, Bp. (of Exeter), to Abp. of Canterbury, 230.
 — to E. B. P., 196, 221, 223, 224, 227, 228, 232, 251, 293, 301, 343.
 Prynne, Rev. G. R., 199.
 Pusey, E. B., 29, 142, 374, 416, 455.
 — to Rev. A. Baker, 375, 377.
 — to Bp. Blomfield, 299, 300.
 — to Rev. Dr. Bull, 408.
 — to Rev. W. Butler, 372.
 — to Archdeacon Churton, 160.
 — to Mr. Justice Coleridge, 211.
 — to Rev. E. Coleridge, 193, 194.
 — to Rev. W. J. Copeland, 141.
 — to Rev. H. T. Ellacombe, 14, 15.
 — to Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, 71, 82, 85, 86, 144, 146, 168, 175, 180, 323, 344, 347, 348, 409.
 — to Rev. D. S. Govett, 32.
 — to Mr. W. Greenhill, 8.
 — to Rev. W. Gresley, 78.
 — to the *Guardian*, 150, 272, 407.
 — to Rev. B. Harrison, 68, 72, 76, 159, 164, 177.
 — to Dr. Hook, 6, 114, 118, 122, 124, 127, 130, 132.

LETTERS (*continued*):—

- Pusey, E. B., to Mr. A. J. B. Hope, 22, 25-27, 191.
 — to Miss M. Hughes, 12.
 — to Rev. J. Keble, 18, 50, 57, 77, 87, 92, 95, 96, 99-101, 103, 108, 133, 151, 154, 155, 169, 192, 199, 216, 217, 220, 225, 227, 247, 257, 261, 274, 276-279, 282, 288, 289, 308, 310, 342, 344, 346, 351, 364, 372, 392, 402, 410, 412, 413, 423-426, 428, 431, 434, 437, 442, 443, 454, 460, 464, 467, 468.
 — to Archdeacon Manning, 52, 152, 206, 209, 371.
 — to Rev. C. Marriott, 162.
 — to the *Morning Chronicle*, 235.
 — to the *Morning Herald*, 148.
 — to Rev. T. E. Morris, 156.
 — to Rev. J. B. Mozley, 54.
 — to Rev. J. H. Newman, 10, 95.
 — to Rev. G. R. Prynne, 369.
 — to his brother Philip, 79, 81, 110, 167, 169, 171, 173, 324.
 — to his son Philip, 365, 375, 411, 455.
 — to his brother William, 416, 417.
 — to Rev. E. T. Richards, 30, 370.
 — to Sender of St. Saviour's Petition, 362.
 — to Rev. Dr. Skinner, 349.
 — to Rev. A. P. Stanley, 391.
 — to Rev. B. Webb, 418.
 — to Dean Wilberforce (Bp.-Elect of Oxford), 40, 43, (now Bp.) 303-307, 318-320, 326, 328-340.
 Pusey, Lady Lucy (mother of E. B. P.), 169, 178.
 — to Lady Emily, 89.
 Pusey, Philip, to E. B. P., 168.
 Symons, Rev. B. P. (Vice-Chancellor), to E. B. P., 56.
 Ward, Rev. W. P., to E. B. P., 5.
 Wilberforce, Bp., to Rev. J. Keble, 312.
 — to Miss Noel, 38.
 — to E. B. P., 35, 37, 42, 46, 322.
 Liddell, Rev. H. G., 380.
 Lightfoot, Dr., 404.
 Lock, Rev. W., 'Biography of John Keble,' cited, 97.
 London, Bp. of, 191, 228.
 London Church Union, 239, 240, 247, 281.
 Longley, Dr. (Bp. of Ripon), 114, 117, 130, 133, 356-367.
 Lowder, Rev. Charles, 378.
 Lushington, Dr., 164, 165, 434, 438, 442.
 Lyttelton, Lord, 13.

M.

- Macbride, Dr., 407.
 Mackay, Rev. D. J., 449, 456.
 Macmullen, Rev. R. G., 113, 114, 117, 125, 128.
 Maitland, Mr. (Librarian to the Abp. of Canterbury), 177.
 Maltby, Dr. (Bp. of Durham), 292.
 Manners, Lord John (afterwards Duke of Rutland), 13.
 Manning, Archdeacon, 58, 89, 110, 134, 152, 206, 241, 248, 272, 276, 285-287, 370.
 Mansel, Rev. H. L., 404, 405.
 Margaret Chapel, Pusey's sermon at, 169-171.
 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister,' by E. B. P., cited, 178, 180.
 Marriott, Rev. C., 59, 77, 82, 86-88, 129, 149, 153, 155, 161, 163, 186, 220, 280, 307, 308, 364, 365, 386, 404, 405, 410, 419-421.
 Maskell, Rev. W., 197, 256, 257, 259-261, 265, 270, 279, 292, 295.
 Maurice, Rev. F. D., 39.
 Mayow, Mr. M. W., 280.
 Medley, Dr. (Bp. of Fredericton), 352.
 Meiners, 387.
 Michell, Rev. Richard, 404.
 Mill, Rev. Prof. W. H., 77, 151, 153, 241, 272, 275, 418.
 Minster, Rev. Thomas, 355, 356, 358, 362, 364.
 Moberly, Mr., 356.
 Moberly, Rev. Dr., 151, 153.
 Montague, Bp., 3.
 Moray, Bishop of, 457.
Morning Chronicle, the, 235.
 Morris, Rev. T. E., 67, 155, 156.
 Mozley, Rev. J. B., 54, 60, 61, 77, 161, 404, 405.
 — 'Letters' cited, 36, 65-67.
 Musgrave, Dr. (Abp. of York), 158, 205, 228.

N.

- Neale, Rev. J. M., 441.
 Neri, St. Philip, 97.
 Newman, Rev. J. H., 90, 364, 394.
 — 'Letters' cited, 10.

O.

- Oakeley, Rev. F., 266.
 Oxenham, Rev. N., 441.
 Oxford, Bp. of (Samuel Wilberforce), 33-49, 161, 302, 303, 307, 309, 313-327, 360.

'Oxford Reform and Oxford Professors,' by H. H. Vaughan, 386.

P.

- Pakington, Sir John, 409.
 Palmer, Rev. W. (afterwards Sir William), 137, 248, 274-276, 280, 284, 285.
 'Papal Aggression,' 291, 293.
 'Paradise of the Christian Soul,' 92, 431.
 Park Village Sisterhood, 23-28, 29, 32, 90, 191, 261.
 Patteson, Mr. Justice, 165.
 Paul, St. Vincent de, 97.
 Peel, Sir Robert, 79, 171.
 Penitentiaries, 370-372.
 Phillpotts, Dr. H. (Bp. of Exeter), 78, 162, 194, 196, 200, 205, 221, 224, 229, 251, 301, 343, 433, 442.
 — 'Letter to Miss Sellon,' 200.
 — 'Letter to the Abp. of Canterbury,' 229-231.
 Pius IX, Pope, 291.
 Plumer, Rev. C. J., 441.
 Plymouth, work of the Devonport Sisters at, 195.
 Pollen, Rev. J. H., 133, 355, 360.
 Popham, Rev. J. L., 441.
 Powell, Prof. Baden, 380.
 Poynt, Bp., 439.
 Prevost, Rev. Sir George, 37, 280.
 Protest against Mr. Gorham's teaching in 'The Efficacy of Baptism,' 252-254.
 Protest of Tutors against interpretation of Baptism by Judicial Committee, 241-244.
 Prynne, Rev. G. R., 195, 196, 199.
 Public Worship Regulation Act, 293.
 Purgatory, 375-377.
 PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE. (*See* LETTERS.) Attempt to revive Sisterhoods, 1-32; visits Ireland, 11; relations with Bishop Wilberforce, 33; growing divergence between them, 36-49; preparation of first sermon after suspension, 49-53; question of subscription, 53-56; revision of sermon, 57; preached in the Cathedral, 58; sketch of the sermon, 61-66; publication, 67; the Jerusalem bishopric, 70-78; proposed University extension, 79-89; serious illness at Tenby, 89; penitence and confession, 94-100; Advent University sermon, 101-103; goes to Hursley for confession, 103; a rule of life, 104; spiritual relation-

ship with Keble, 109; seclusion, 110; difficulties at St. Saviour's, misunderstandings with Hook, 112; Pusey's defence, 127; secession of Macmullen, 128; resignation of Ward, 130; further disagreements, 131; Rev. A. P. Forbes Vicar of St. Saviour's, 133; isolation, 137; sermon at Horfield, 138; confidence in the Church of England, 142; public distrust caused by secessions at St. Saviour's, refusal to explain, 144; rumours and contradictions, 147; plan for a Commentary on the Bible, 149; suggested contributors, 155; its fate, 157; Dr. Hampden nominated Bishop of Hereford, renewal of controversy, 158; action of Bp. Wilberforce, 161; the Irish Famine, 167; sermon at Margaret Chapel, 170; denunciation of luxury, 171; Oxford University election of 1847, 173; Jewish disabilities, 175; Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, 176-185; stay at Hayling Island, 186; gossip, 188; S. G. O. and the *Times*, 190; Park Village community, 191; Miss Sellon at Devonport, 192; inquiry by the Bp. of Exeter, 197; outbreak of cholera at Devonport, 199; the Gorham case, 201-234; on the Canons of the Council of Trent, 206; Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, 209; defining powers of the Final Court of Appeal, 211; 'Clergy Proceedings Bill,' 221; idea of a Diocesan Synod, 227; reply to Rev. W. Goode's letter, 231; on 'Praeventient Grace,' 235; protests against Gorham decision, 241; meeting at St. Martin's Hall, 246; at Freemasons' Hall, 248; speeches by Keble and Pusey, 249; 'The Royal Supremacy,' 257; Mr. Dodsworth's sermons, 261; 'The Church of England leaves her children free,' &c., 266; Declaration on the Royal Supremacy, 271; objections to Mr. Palmer's Anti-Roman declaration, 274; speech in St. Martin's Hall, 281; secession of Manning and Robert Wilberforce, 285; Bp. Blomfield's charge, 294; 'Letter to the Bishop,' 297; causes of secessions, 299; 'Renewed Explanation,' 301; Bp. Wilberforce's demand and Pusey's reply, 303; inhibition, 307; explanations, 308-319; Pusey invites prosecution, 319; interview with the Bishop, 325; inhibition

withdrawn, 327; Letters to the Bishop, 328-340; Diocesan Synods, 341; admission of laymen, 343; revival of Convocation, 352; further troubles at St. Saviour's, 353; visits to Leeds, 364; correspondence with the Bp. of Ripon, 366; beginnings of Ritualism, 368; Penitentiary work, 370; orphanages, 372; Irvingism, 373; Purgatory, 375; the University Reform Act, 380; the Professorial System, 381; its effect on religious faith, 383; lay or clerical education, 384; reply to Professor Vaughan, 387; teaching of Natural Science, 391; petition to Convocation, 392; altered relations with the Hebdomadal Board, 394; Bill for University Reform, 395; founders' intentions, 401; the new Hebdomadal Council, 404; death of Lady Emily, and marriage of Mary Pusey, 411; illness of his brother Philip, 413; his death, 414; death of Lady Lucy, 415; deaths of Dr. Mill and Dean Gaisford, 418; illness of Charles Marriott, 419; his death, 421; sermon on the Eucharist, 424; 'Notes' to the same, 431; judgment on Archdeacon Denison, 433; protest against it, 440; treatise on the Real Presence, 447; at Paris, 450; Scotch Eucharistic Controversies, 451, 452, 455; contributes appendix to Keble's 'Considerations,' 453, 454; short account of work 'On the Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist,' 470.

Pusey, Lady Emily (sister-in-law of E. B. P.), 89, 91, 404, 411-413.

Pusey, Lady Lucy (mother of E. B. P.), 67, 415, 416.

Pusey, Lucy (eldest daughter of E. B. P.), 4; death of, 12, 95.

Pusey, Mary (daughter of E. B. P.), 304, 410, 411.

Pusey, Philip (brother of E. B. P.), 168, 403, 413-415.

Q.

Quarterly Review, quoted, 2.

R.

'Real Presence in the Fathers,' by E. B. P., cited, 432, 447.

'Reception by the Wicked,' 436.

Retreats for Clergy, 377, 378.

Richards, Dr. (Rector of Exeter College), 174.

Richards, Rev. E. T. (Vicar of Farlington), 186.
 Richards, Rev. H., 138.
 Richards, Rev. W. U., 18, 266, 269.
 Romilly, Lord, 368.
 Rooke, Rev. S., 361, 364.
 Round, J. E. (Balliol College), 174, 175.
 Routh, Dr. (President of Magdalen), 245.
 Royal Commission on Law of Marriage, 178.
 Royal Supremacy, Declaration touching, 271, 273, 276.
 'Royal Supremacy, The,' by E. B. P., 257, 258, 260, 262, 341.
 Russell, Lord John, 158, 175, 205, 292, 295, 300, 379, 398, 403.

S.

St. Andrews, Bp. of, 457.
 Sandon, Lord (afterwards Earl of Harrowby), 79.
 Scott, Dr. (Master of Balliol), 404.
 Scott, Rev. W., 77, 442.
 Scott, Sir William, 229.
 Sellon, Miss, 192, 193, 198, 199.
 Selwyn, Bp., 188.
 SERMONS by E. B. P.:—
 At Horfield, 138.
 Chastisements, Fast-day sermon at Margaret Chapel, 170.
 Entire Absolution of the Penitent, preached in Cathedral after suspension, 62-64, 94, 98, 102, 103, 422.
 Eucharist, The, 424, 425, 431.
 Hope, preached at Hayling Island, 187.
 On St. Luke's Day, 101.
 Rule of Faith, The, as maintained by the Fathers and the Church of England, preached before the University, 318, 422.
 Sewell, Rev. W., 137, 174, 248.
 S. G. O., Letter to the *Times*, 190.
 Shaftesbury, Lord, 368.
 Simeon, Rev. Charles, 97, 98.
 Sisterhoods, 1-32.
 Sisters of Mercy, Circular of London Committee, 18-21.
 Skinner, Bp. (of Aberdeen), 345, 348.
 Society of Friends, The, 8.
 Somerset and Bristol Church Union, 280.
 Southey, Robert, 'Colloquies,' 18.
 Spranger, Rev. R. J., 155.
 Stanley, Rev. A. P. (afterwards Dean of Westminster), 380, 391.

Stuart, Rev. E., 442.
 'Studia Sacra,' 151.
 Suarez, 257.
 Sumner, Dr. C. (Bishop of Winchester), 39, 283.
 Sumner, Dr. J. B. (Abp. of Canterbury), 205, 221, 225, 228, 234, 255, 428, 434, 445.
 Symons, Rev. B. P. (Vice-Chancellor, Warden of Wadham), 55, 56, 404.

T.

Tait, Dr. (afterwards Abp. of Canterbury), 380.
 Talbot, John C., 241.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 3.
 Tenby, illness of E. B. P. at, 89, 98, 172.
 Terrot, Miss, 17.
 Thomine, Abbé, 11.
 Thorndike, Dr., 3.
 Thorp, Archdeacon, 241.
Times, the, 66, 168, 170, 173, 190.
 Townsend, Mr., 161.
 Trent, Council of, Letter by E. B. P. on, 206.
 Trower, Bp., 449.
 Tyler, Rev. J. E., 179.

U.

University Reform Act, 395, 401, 404.
 Urban II, Pope, 267.

V.

Vaughan, Prof. H. H., 386-388.
 Vicar-General, the, 164, 165.

W.

Ward, Rev. Richard, 113, 117, 125, 130, 360.
 Ward, Rev. W. Perceval, 5, 442.
 Watson, Alexander, 280.
 Watts-Russell, Mr., 13.
 Wellington, Duke of, 403.
 Wesley, John, 97.
 Whately, Abp., 179.
 Wilberforce, Archdeacon, R. I., 89, 217, 241, 248, 272, 286-288, 290, 351, 426.
 — 'Doctrine of Holy Baptism,' 287.
 — 'Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,' 288.
 — 'Principles of Church Authority,' 426, 428.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Wilberforce, Rev. Henry W., 210,
241, 279.
Wilberforce, S. <i>See</i> Oxford, Bp. of.
— 'Life of,' cited, 36, 37, 162, 303,
307, 309, 312, 313, 317, 322, 442.
Williams, Dr. (Warden of New Col-
lege), 404.
Williams, Rev. G. (King's College,
Cambridge), 133, 155, 457.
Williams, Rev. Isaac, 51, 58, 151,
155, 442.</p> | <p>Wilson, Prof., 404.
Wilson, Rev. R. F., 155, 415.
Wiseman, Dr. (afterwards Cardinal),
179, 239.
Woodford, Rev. J. R., 442.
Woodgate, Rev. H. A., 175.
Wortley, Mr. Stuart, 177, 178.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Y.</p> <p>Yard, Rev. G. B., 442.</p> |
|--|---|

END OF VOL. III.

283.092
P979ℓ

93926

Liddon, Henry P.

283.092
P979ℓ

93926
v.3

Liddon, Henry P.
Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey

